

THE
CHRISTIAN EXAMINER
AND
GENERAL REVIEW.

NEW SERIES — No. XIII.

MARCH, 1831.

CONTENTS.

ART.	PAGE	ART.	PAGE
I. MORAL EDUCATION		Exegetical Essays on several Words relating to Future Punishment.	
1. The Library of Education. Edited by WILLIAM RUSSELL. Vol. I. Containing 'Some Thoughts concerning Education, by JOHN LOCKE,' and, 'A Treatise on Education, by JOHN MILTON.'		V. WORKS OF THE REV. ROBERT HALL	64
2. Account of the Edinburgh Sessional School, and the other Parochial Institutions for Education, established in that City in the Year 1812; with Strictures on Education in general. By JOHN WOOD, Esq.		The Works of the Rev. Robert Hall, A. M. Minister of Broadmead Chapel, Bristol, England. First complete Edition; with a brief Memoir of the Author.	
II. PRISON DISCIPLINE	15	VI. STUART AND WHITMAN	87
1. Reports of the Board of Managers of the Prison Discipline Society.		1. A Letter to William E. Channing, D. D. on the subject of Religious Liberty. By MOSES STUART, Professor of Sacred Literature in the Theological Seminary, Andover.	
2. Fifth Annual Report of the Board of Managers of the Prison Discipline Society.		2. Two Letters to the Reverend Moses Stuart, on the subject of Religious Liberty. By BERNARD WHITMAN.	
III. COLLECTION OF PSALMS AND HYMNS	30	VII. THEOLOGICAL SCHOOL IN HARVARD UNIVERSITY	129
A Collection of Psalms and Hymns for Christian Worship.		Dr. Codman's Speech in the Board of Overseers of Harvard College, February 3, 1831.	
IV. MEANING OF Atonement	34		
Professor Stuart's Appendix to his			

BOSTON:
PUBLISHED BY GRAY AND BOWEN.

LONDON:
ROWLAND HUNTER, AND O. RICH, RED LION SQUARE.

LIVERPOOL:
EDWARD WILLMER, LORD STREET.

1831.

NOTICE.

THE present Number of the Christian Examiner commences under a new arrangement, the Editorial department having been transferred to other hands. The mechanical and business part of the work is now under the sole management of the Publishers.

It will be issued hereafter *punctually*, on the first days of January, March, May, July, September, and November.

All communications may be directed to the Editors of the Christian Examiner, care of Gray & Bowen.

The publishers cannot let the present opportunity pass, without gratefully acknowledging the punctuality with which the subscriptions to this work have been paid, and the attention which the agents have given to it; and they trust that a corresponding promptness and attention will be discovered on their part.

GRAY & BOWEN.

GRAY & BOWEN,

NO. 141 WASHINGTON STREET, BOSTON,

HAVE JUST PUBLISHED

I.

A SUPERB BIBLE,

Without Note or Comment, in two Volumes, *Imperial Octavo*.

The design of the Publishers in this work is to produce the most perfect specimen of Typography of which the American Press is capable.—The paper is of the finest quality; the volumes are large Octavo, resembling those of the beautiful English Edition, which is generally known under the name of Westall's Bible. The type, which is large and open, is perfectly new and was manufactured for the work. The greatest attention has been paid to accuracy, and the work has been carefully collated with the best Oxford Editions. One exquisite Engraving accompanies the work.

II.

REPLY TO PROFESSOR STUART.

TWO LETTERS to the Rev. Moses Stuart on Religious Liberty, occasioned by his Letter to the Rev. W. E. Channing. By BERNARD WHITMAN. *Second Edition*.

Persons wishing to procure the above, will be promptly supplied by the Publishers. A discount will be allowed to agents and those who purchase to distribute.

III.

A HARMONY OF THE GOSPELS,

On the Plan proposed by LANT CARPENTER, LL. D.

'This publication, the Editor of which is understood to be the Rev. J. G. PALFREY, supplies a want which has been felt by many. The advantages of studying the evangelical histories of our Saviour's life, disposed in the form of a harmony, are obvious; and the work before us, as the plan of it seems to us preferable to any other, we strongly recommend to general use. It will aid ministers in their expository lectures, be serviceable in Sunday Schools, and afford facilities of Scriptural instruction in private families.' — *Christian Examiner*.

THE
CHRISTIAN EXAMINER.

N^o. XLIII.

NEW SERIES—N^o. XIII.

MARCH, 1831.

- ART. I. — 1. *The Library of Education*. Edited by WILLIAM RUSSELL. Vol. I. Containing *Some Thoughts concerning Education*, by JOHN LOCKE, and *A Treatise of Education*, by JOHN MILTON. Boston: Gray & Bowen. 1830. 12mo. pp. 317.
2. *Account of the Edinburgh Sessional School, and the other Parochial Institutions for Education, established in that City in the Year 1812; with Strictures on Education in general*. By JOHN WOOD, Esq. Printed at Edinburgh. Boston: Reprinted by Munroe & Francis. 1830. 12mo. pp. 204.

THE first of these volumes is a reprint of works which have been long known to scholars, but not, we presume, very generally read. Milton's *Treatise*, however, is so short, that, though it well deserves the space which it occupies in this publication, it cannot prove of much practical assistance to parents or teachers. The plan of Locke, in his '*Thoughts concerning Education*,' embraced a greater variety of topics, and amplitude of discussion; and his work ought to be a manual with all who are interested in the important subject of which it treats. Its plain good sense, its lucid order, its excellent morality, make it one of the most valuable works which parent or teacher can read. We know not that we can praise it more highly than by saying, that it is just such a work as we should have expected from John Locke, the gentleman, philosopher, scholar, and Christian.

The 'Account of the Edinburgh Sessional School' deserves to become a standard on elementary instruction. It describes with minuteness of detail the results of actual experiment, and it is, which we certainly did not look for, not only a practical, but an entertaining book.

Encouraged by the appearance of these works, we venture to offer some remarks on the worn but not worn-out subject of moral education; for such works would hardly have been published here, if the interest of the community in the subject had ceased.

We have abundant reason for gratitude to Heaven, and to those instruments in the hands of Heaven, our worthy ancestors, for the numerous and excellent institutions of learning, and means of education which we in this country enjoy. For the most part, we evince our gratitude for them by the value which we set upon them; though we are not yet grateful enough, for we do not yet value them highly enough. We do not value them highly enough, because we do not correctly appreciate nor universally understand the great purpose and end of instruction. Many among us are not in the habit of regarding this purpose as a moral purpose, and this end as a moral end. We are afraid that, from the poorest to the richest of us, the mind is considered as the principal object of education, and the information of the mind as education's peculiar and ultimate design. Though there exists very remarkably in our country, or at least in this part of our country, a great desire in parents to secure an education to their children, and a general willingness to spend their money for this gift, yet we believe that it is common for the poor to bestow what means of education they can on their children, under the sole idea of preserving them from the disgrace and the inconvenience of ignorance, and for the rich to furnish their children with every accomplishment which wealth can command, with the predominant impression and hope that they are qualifying them to push their way in the world, and make a figure in the eyes of society. They do not seem to extend their views, or if at all, not with a due anxiety, to that far nobler and more important office of education, which is simply and beautifully described in the words of the prophet Ezekiel. They seem not to apprehend that it confers its best and most finished endowment on their offspring, only when it has taught them 'the difference between

the holy and profane, and caused them to discern between the unclean and the clean.'

This is education's perfect work. When it has done this, it has done every thing; and till it has done this, it has done nothing effectually. Who has a finished education, as far as any education may be called finished? Not he who is often complimented by the world on its possession. Not he who has been through all the most expensive schools, and yet without learning his duty to God and his neighbour. No; if he is master of all accomplishments; if his brain is filled to its remotest cell with all manner of knowledge, and still he does not discern, or does not act as if he discerned, between the unclean and the clean, his education is not finished in the most important respect; it is imperfect; it has stopped short of its destination, for it has stopped short of true wisdom, and the pupil is as yet immature, superficial, unfurnished. Who has a finished education? He has it, who, though he may have only learned to read and write, has learned, beside, the difference, the immense difference, between the holy and profane; has cultivated his moral capacities; has acquired sound opinions, and firm principles, and good habits; has preferred and chosen the paths and the rewards of virtue. His education is really finished, for its true end is attained; it has given him the wisdom to perceive, the ability to discharge, his personal, his social, his religious obligations; it has placed him as a column in the great fabric of human relations; and though he may not adorn that fabric, to the eye, as much as some other columns which art has more carefully enriched, he supports it quite as well in the simple beauty of strength and durability.

We mean not to say, that every thing which informs and enlarges and embellishes the mind, has not a natural tendency to educate the heart, and establish the character on enduring foundations. We cannot be such recreants to the noble cause and holy faith of letters. We believe that education, in all its fulness, and all its variety, has a powerful and beneficial influence on morals. It is precisely because we believe this, that we say it is never finished till it has exerted that influence; morals being its end. Mind is its first object, but it is not its only, nor its final object. Through the mind it must reach the moral sentiments and convictions, or it reaches not its mark. That is but a partial education,

which does not lead its pupil to the knowledge and the practice of duty. That is a complete education, the education of a man, which makes a man feel himself one ; an accountable creature of God ; a free and a noble spirit, discerning the difference between the holy and profane, the unclean and the clean, and renouncing the evil and embracing the good, for his own sake, for society's sake, and for God's sake.

That by such an education, and in no other way, or in no other way so well, some of the greatest blessings of life are to be widely and permanently secured, we have no doubt. If such an education is impracticable to any greater extent and degree than has already been attained, then, with all our faith in human improvement, we should be obliged to acknowledge that no further improvement was to be hoped for, in this world. A few remarks on some of the advantages which can only result from a general and thorough system of moral education, will best explain our reasons for attributing to it so great an importance.

We must be permitted to say, then, that we know not in what other way the best political blessings are to be secured to our country. We are as prosperous, as powerful, and as free as we are, chiefly because we have been thus far, and comparatively speaking, an intelligent and a moral people ; because knowledge has been remarkably diffused among us, and our habits have been simple, and for the most part virtuous and religious. But luxury has increased with our wealth, corruption with our numbers, and ambition with our strength. The virtue which carried us through the time of our tribulation, may relax and be dissolved in the time of our prosperity. Those principles of honesty and justice and freedom which we only wrapped the more closely about us while the storms of persecution and poverty were blowing, may be loosened and perhaps thrown off under the warm suns of plenty and ease. It was a day of peril and of trial, when, to guard their rights and liberties against an arrogant and superior force, our fathers stood on the brink 'few and faint, yet fearless still,' and dared and suffered the worst ; but, if we are not greatly mistaken, our country may see a day more perilous and trying than that ; the day when it will have to contend with the passion and the pride and the lust of its own children. If it escapes from such a trial safely and with honor, it will be only owing to the prevailing

moral sentiment of the people, diffused through their mass by all the efforts and means of a moral education.

We form a republic. We are all politically equal. The right of government is shared by every individual in the nation; and Heaven forbid that it should be otherwise. But this right of government must be delegated somewhere. We must have rulers like other nations. We appoint these rulers ourselves, and in their hands we place in trust much of our happiness. What is to secure to us good rulers, rulers who will respect and watch that sacred deposit, but the widest diffusion of correct opinions and feelings through the influences of a moral education? What is to secure us against unprincipled rulers, but a deep respect for principle, and a stern, uncompromising demand for men of principle, and a universal determination to bestow no confidence on talent alone without principle? What is to secure us against the winding, specious, flattering arts of political quacks and demagogues, but an understanding sufficiently informed to detect those arts, and a virtue sufficiently elevated to despise them? What, in fine, is to carry the best men to the highest and most responsible places, but the existence and the predominance in the community of worth, of moral worth, which will appreciate and sympathize with, and seek out worth like its own, for honor, office, and trust? And how shall we secure this moral worth in the community, unless it is instilled, guarded, and confirmed by all the influences and appliances of a moral education universally diffused?

And what, again we ask, is to preserve us from a national passion for war and the deeds of war, an admiration of military fame, a love of dominion, a thirst for conquest? What is to preserve us from these things, which have been among the deepest stains and curses of the world from the world's childhood, but a general sentiment, which, with purged and undazzled eyes, shall view war rather as a scourge, a judgment, than as a theatre of glory? Why should we not go on, as other nations have gone on, extending our possessions by the sword, and losing them by the sword, attacking and attacked, spoiling and spoiled, and devoting treasure, talent, and life, to the insane purpose of fighting with the rest of the world, and entailing on ourselves that misery, be it splendid or otherwise, which is always entailed by ambitious war, unless we are taught by experience and religion to regard war

as that last, terrible resort, which good men in all ages, though not, alas! the multitude, have considered it to be? If we feel and think on this and kindred subjects as other nations have thought and felt, why should we not take the path of other nations, and stride on through luxury, and what is called glory, to ruin and oblivion?

Every thing depends, under Providence, on the education and intellectual and moral habits of our people. Where each man has, as here, a voice and a vote, the fate of the whole hangs on the disposition and character of the majority. If the majority, the great mass of the nation, are brought up to entertain sober views, to regard consequences, to suspect their passions and respect their reason, to divest themselves of sectional prejudices, to study the things that make for peace, to know and to feel the difference between the holy and profane, and to value virtue more than fame or eloquence or any thing else that can be named, then there can be no fear for our liberty, our prosperity, our union, or stability; no fear of enemies without or factions within, no fear of bad rulers, or misguided mobs, or any permanently evil influence, for power will be righteous, and righteousness will be all powerful; there will be a natural junction of right and might which nothing human can overcome and disturb. But if the majority are to grow up uninformed, undisciplined, discerning nothing but the present, and that but partially and passionately, overflowing with local and petty antipathies, south against north, and east against west, easily inflamed, easily led, and always most easily by the most interested guides, then fear may augur the worst.

These remarks are made without any reference to the present promises or prospects of the country, which we are willing to believe are of a favorable description. We have merely been drawing inferences from the nature of our government. We, the people, govern ourselves. The main object of our solicitude, therefore, an object of far more importance than any temporary question of party politics, should be, to know *how* to govern ourselves, or, which with us amounts to the same thing, how we ought to be governed. In other words, our first political duty is a moral self-education, as thorough as possible, and as widely diffused. If we faithfully attend to this duty, it requires little sagacity to predict that our destiny is a truly glorious one, the most glorious

that has yet been achieved on earth. If we neglect it, it requires as little to foresee, that if our fortune is not to be more melancholy than that of other nations has been, it will differ but little from the common course; we shall follow in the beaten track, and pursue the accustomed trade,

‘A wild and dreamlike trade of blood and guile,
Too foolish for a tear, too wicked for a smile!’

But we will pass from this topic, which may be thought to be of too general a nature, and touch upon one or two others which are more special and definite.

Let us speak of the influence of a moral education in suppressing or checking a vice which has been said, but we hope not truly, to be more common in this country than in any other. Whether more common or not, it is fearfully prevalent, and comparison is altogether unnecessary to impress us with a vivid sense of its magnitude. We mean the vice of intemperance. We need not describe it, its nature, character, or consequences. We need not tell how odious and degrading it is in itself, and how often it becomes the parent of other vices, as bad, or worse. Its ravages have been so extensive and terrible, that within a few years the public attention has been most seriously directed to it, and various measures have been proposed and tried with the design of arresting its progress. For this purpose, societies have been formed, sermons have been preached, tracts have been distributed, newspapers have been established. These means have in some degree, perhaps we should say, in a great degree, effected their end. Let them not be sneered at because they have not effected every thing. There was never a society formed yet, by sensible men, with a moral object in view, which did not accomplish something toward that object. United thoughts suggest expedients, and united efforts arrest public attention. Thus much has been done, if no more, by the societies which have been formed for the suppression of intemperance. From the nature of the case, this is about all which they can do, or ought to be expected to do. Much remains to be done by education, by moral education, which nothing but a moral education can do. The lessons of moderation must be particularly enforced on the young. They must be made to see the sure connexion between intemperance and shame and misery. They must be made to con-

sider a spectacle of intoxication in the street, as a subject, not of mirth, but of pity and dread. They must be taught that there are other and better social pleasures than that of drinking; that there are other and more effectual consolations in sorrow than that of drinking; and those pleasures and those consolations must be placed before them, and within their reach. They must be taught to feel that they have a nature too high and heavenly in its origin and capacities, to be enslaved to an indulgence lower than brutal. They must respect it, and fear to wrong and insult and debase it. They must be led to exercise self-government; to know their own strength, and to rejoice in it; to feel themselves superior to a poor temptation of appetite; to feel it to be impossible that they could ever sacrifice their respectability, their substance, their health, their talents, the feelings of their friends, and the favor of their God, to the vile solicitations of intemperance.

These are lessons which can and must be taught, more assiduously than they ever yet have been. These lessons of wisdom, prudence, and duty, begin at the beginning, and by preventing the vice, do better than cure it. They may be inculcated by various instructors, and in ten thousand different ways. They may be taught to the poor, as well as to the rich. There is nothing chimerical in the idea of such instruction. If there is, the idea of any improvement in this respect is chimerical. One thing appears to us very evident, which is, that nothing but lessons of morality and soberness, well taught and well learned, will make us a sober people; for nothing but a moral elevation will raise us above a moral reproach; and those who are low in their thoughts, sentiments, and principles, will be also low, and you cannot help it, in their pleasures and tastes.

There is another subject on which we would say a few words in this connexion, because it is also one which has occupied considerable attention in this portion of the country. We refer to the observance of the Lord's Day as a day of rest. The reason for the attention which has been lately paid to this subject, is not that the Lord's Day has not been observed here, but that it has hitherto been observed with such extreme strictness, that any deviations from the former course have been regarded by many as alarming proofs of degeneracy. The truth is, that the Christian Sabbath is remarkably well kept in this section of the country; but as

population increases, variety of pursuits will keep pace with it, some of which will be incompatible with the strict observance of the day of rest. Travelling, for instance, of all kinds, will increase, and of course necessary travelling, and all the means, facilities, and appendages of travelling. To make a law which should distinguish between necessary and unnecessary travelling and their accompaniments, would be impossible. Nor would the people long submit to any law on the subject; nor ought they; it would be reversed, or it would fall into disuse. The only provisions which can be made with regard to it, are the provisions of moral education. We have begun well. We are in a good path. We have inherited from our forefathers a respect for the Lord's Day, its duties and its rest. We devoutly hope that the inheritance may never be undervalued or dissipated; that the feeling may never be diminished. But we are sincerely of opinion, that the only method of insuring so desirable an object, is to keep up, and indeed greatly to confirm and spread abroad the moral habits of the people, by making a moral education our chief concern. If we cherish among us a regard for religious privileges, for order, for peacefulness, for duty, we need not tremble for the Christian Sabbath. A day, which in its quiet observance harmonizes so beautifully with these blessings, and contributes so much to their security, will always be well observed. Man will see that it is made for him, for his use and for his good, and he will keep it holy. But if the public moral sentiment, and perception of obligation, and love of quiet happiness and intellectual occupation, are not fostered; if boisterous pleasures come to be preferred to peaceful ones, and dissipation to improvement, the Lord's Day, so long hallowed by us, and endeared to us, will be desecrated, as a matter of course, and a volume of laws could not prevent the desecration. We do not permit ourselves to harbour the fear that such an event will take place; but if it should, our Sabbath bells, which have heretofore rung out, on every first day of the week, their cheerful call to rest and praise and prayer, might well be taught to toll a knell throughout the land for the death of ancient virtue.

Why should we say more? The simple fact that the course and the fate of this country depend, under Providence, on the character of the mass of its inhabitants, is proof sufficient to my mind, that the moral education of all classes, and

all ages, but more particularly of the poor and the young, is the one thing needful. If the people are lifted up into knowledge, virtue, and respectability, their course will be an elevated one ; if not, it will be a vulgar, and finally a miserable one ; for they will take their own way.

If we are asked, what are the means of moral education, and how they are to be applied, and who shall apply them, we answer, the means are numberless, and they are to be applied in many various ways, and by many descriptions of persons, a few only of which we have time to specify.

Schools are to be supported with liberality, and multiplied to the extent of the demand. Too many children should not be crowded together in one school, nor more pupils be placed under one master than he can well attend to. Our good opinion of a town always rises, according to the number of schools which it contains in proportion to the number of its inhabitants.

The office of instructor of youth should always be regarded as an important and dignified office, and treated accordingly. Instructors of the best acquirements should always be sought for ; and when found, should be honored and well supported. You certainly do not wish to look down on him as an inferior, who has the care of the minds of your children. But you cannot avoid doing so, unless his talents and attainments really entitle him to your respect ; and you cannot think of obtaining one thus respectable, unless you afford to his labors that remuneration which they would secure in other professions. It is poor policy and poor economy, to look out for the cheapest schoolmaster who is to be had ; for the cheapest is generally the dearest, because he is generally the least worth what is given for him. A good education, a really good education is the best legacy which you can leave to your children ; and it becomes you to be sparing in any thing rather than in that. We do not mean that you should be extravagant, even in education ; but, we adjure you, parents, by all that is worthy and respectable, by the honor and happiness of your children, and by your own hopes for them, do not consider education the least of necessities, or the least of comforts ; do not put it down among the lowest of your expenses ; do not make it the last of your indulgences, but rather the first. It is, as we have said, the best legacy. It has no wings, like riches. It does not pass away with youth. It

cannot be alienated, and it only increases in value with years. Let the instructors of your children, therefore, be well qualified to instruct them. Above all, see that they are unimpeachable in their moral character; for no other qualification will supply the absence of this. The air of a school-room is tainted and poisoned by the presence of an immoral teacher; let not your children breathe it.

Books of instruction are to be carefully examined and selected, that they may always inculcate the soundest and purest views of life, conduct, and happiness, and inculcate them in the most engaging and convincing manner. Children receive many of their first and deepest impressions from school-books. It is highly important that these impressions should be of a virtuous stamp, and that they should also be associations of pleasantness.

No change in the modes of education, which promises to be a real improvement, should be slighted. We must not permit our attachment to old methods to prevent our adopting new ones which are better. Experiment is the natural pioneer of improvement, and should not be discouraged in its vocation and duty. Education has already been made to bear closely and powerfully on the mass. We should leave no means untried to make it bear still more closely and powerfully. Lyceums have done and are doing much in our villages. Public lectures have done and are doing much in our cities and towns. We have it from unquestionable authority, that crowds of young men attend constantly and with interest on these means of information, who, a little while ago, spent their evenings at places of resort, which are always very questionable, often fatal. This change cannot operate otherwise than to produce great and general benefit.

Parents—what a weight of responsibility there is upon them! How much the moral education of their children depends on their efforts, advice, and example! What a power they have over the character of the coming generation! How deeply does it concern them to inculcate on those entrusted to their care, the necessity of virtue and religion, and to show forth their beauty and glory by the whole course of their example! Vain will be the teachings of schools, if they are not confirmed at home. Vain will be the lessons of the tutor, if they are not seconded by the precepts and conduct of the father and the mother. The child must not only read of goodness

and purity in the books which are placed before him ; he must read of them in the looks, the words, and the actions of those whom nature directs him to imitate, and habit brings him to resemble. There is hardly a sight so distressing, so alarming, to the real patriot and philanthropist, as the sight of parents, who, whatever they may teach with their lips, are teaching their children, day by day, in the constant tenor of their lives, to be selfish, to be frivolous, to be worldly, to be deceitful, to prefer earthly things to heavenly, to cherish the body and to forget the soul.

Parents and instructors should not only select good books for those who are committed to their oversight, but should qualify themselves for this and other kindred duties, by reading and digesting the best books on education, and thus instruct themselves. Much is doubtless to be left to the good sense and daily experience of those who have the guidance of the young ; but we should be far from respecting the self-confidence of any one who should think himself above deriving assistance from such books as those the titles of which we have placed at the head of this article. He should have the care of no child of ours. And yet we should dislike a literal bigot to any particular system of education, as much as we dislike a bigot to a set of theological articles, or any system whatever.

As moral education is nearly connected with general education, the instruction which is given to all classes of society should be as generous and liberal, as various and elevated, as means and circumstances will allow. In a country like this, if you would have a moral people, you must have an educated people, a people who are taught something more than to read and write. Do not fear that education will make the poor vain and pedantic. Be assured that the more they know, the less vain they will be of their knowledge. And even if a variety of information should have the effect upon them which is feared, it is far better that they should be vain and pedantic, than coarse, sensual, and criminal. There is no reason to apprehend that any considerable number of those who are to gain their living by their toil, will quit their tools and their shops, and turn knights-errant in a dim and visionary quest of literary adventure. A few individuals, peculiarly constituted, or peculiarly influenced, may do so ; but common sense and necessity will keep all the rest to the work

or employment to which they are bred, and for which they are fitted, and in which, whatever it may be, every one may raise himself above want and above contempt. The great evil to be apprehended is a want rather than an excess of a disposition to mental exertion and improvement. For what are the principal causes of crime? They are inconsiderateness and idleness. They are the want of habits of reflection, and the want of innocent and interesting employment. Both of these wants are supplied by education. Teach people to reflect and give them the means of mental occupation, and in general they will avoid crime, because they will be aware of its miserable consequences, and will have something better to think of and to accomplish. Every exercise of the mind which causes it to know how to use itself, and every species of information which furnishes it with objects of employment, is a more powerful security against crime, than any physical durance which can be devised.

The last chapter of Wood's 'Account of the Edinburgh Sessional School' contains a lively and complete answer to those who are wont to lift up their voices in dismal prophecies of the fatal effects of instructing the poor beyond their alphabet. We wish we could make several extracts from this chapter, but we must content ourselves with one.

'And what is it after all, which is deemed so peculiarly objectionable in the education furnished by the Edinburgh Sessional School? Is it that the poor are there taught to *read*? No! our objectors now tell us, "Give them by all means as much reading, writing, and arithmetic, as you please." What then? Can it be right to teach them to read, but wrong to make them *understand* what they read? It would be quite idle for us to pause to point out the absurdity of so futile an objection. But, if our readers have gone along with us in some of the preceding observations, they will be inclined to think the objection something worse than absurd. They will at once perceive, that if *reading* is to be put within the reach of the humbler classes, it is absolutely essential, not only in order to give them the full benefit of that reading, but as a preservative against the dangers to which they may be exposed from improper publications, that their minds should at the same time receive due cultivation, and be adequately fortified against the assaults of the unprincipled and designing. There are others who tell us, "We make no objection to your *explaining*; that is all quite right and necessary, but as for your *Geography*, — what have these poor creatures to do with geography?" In

other words, "Explain to them every thing else but places; tell them what you please about animals, and plants, and stones; but, as you prize their happiness, or the good of mankind for any sake, tell them nothing about countries, or cities, or rivers, their situation, or the circumstances for which they are remarkable." This is a distinction which we own we are quite unable to understand. There appears to us in truth to be no study more innocent than geography, and few more useful or better adapted to all classes of society. What possible injury can accrue to a child from knowing where Glasgow or London is, or even Paris or Petersburg, or any of those places where his friends happen to be, or of which he has occasion to read or to hear? When in reading about St. Paul's travels, for example, the child comes to the word "Cyprus," and asks what Cyprus is, may we tell him that it is a word of six letters and two syllables, with the accent on the former syllable, — point out to him its orthography, anxiously warning him against substituting an *i* for a *y*, — and perhaps moreover inform him, that it is a noun of the neuter gender, singular number, and objective case; but when the child still presses us to tell him what the word means, must we say to him, "My dear boy, we may teach you the proper sound, spelling, and grammar of this word, but with this you must be content; ask no more, for this is one of those things which it is deemed dangerous, and we are therefore not permitted, to explain to you." Some one perhaps will retort, that "he has no dislike to a child being told incidentally where a place is, that his objection only extends to every thing like regular teaching by a *map*, and that in the present instance he thinks it would be quite wrong not to tell the child that Cyprus is an island in the Mediterranean Sea." But what danger lurks behind a map? And is it not quite obvious that to a pupil placed in such circumstances as our objector would have him, the Mediterranean sea must be just as unintelligible as Cyprus previously was and still is?' — pp. 202, 203.

Let every thing be taught, then, for which there is time and opportunity. Away with that libel and insult on the mind of man, that it was not formed for improvement, and that knowledge is not good for it. Pour down instruction on the land, even on our land, like rain, for even yet it is dry and athirst. 'Let the ridges thereof be watered abundantly. Let the showers drop upon the pastures and the wilderness, till they rejoice on every side, and shout and sing!'

- ART. II. — 1. *Reports of the Board of Managers of the Prison Discipline Society.* Boston. 1830. pp. 330.
2. *Fifth Annual Report of the Board of Managers of the Prison Discipline Society.* Boston. 1830. pp. 96.

WE regret that we have not sooner called the attention of our readers to the subject of prison discipline, and to the Reports we have named above. It is a subject, the importance of which, in the present state of our community, can hardly be exceeded or exaggerated; and it is treated, in the Reports of the managers of the Boston society, in so thorough and able a manner, as to leave little to be desired or added. In our notice of them we propose merely to invite attention to the subject; or rather, we wish to urge the propriety of devoting some portion of our time or substance to this interesting and important mode of exercising Christian charity. If it be true of any form of mercy, that 'it blesseth him that gives, and him that takes,' it is doubly so of this, which seeks to devise the best means of saving society from crime, and reclaiming the guilty violaters of its laws; of restoring those, who, either through a long course of vice, or a single false step, have forfeited their station in society; of awakening the better principles which slumber within them, and thus imitating and coöperating with the providence of God; of promoting at once the good of those within and those without the walls of the prison, and producing effects, the advantage of which may be felt by others and by ourselves, through the whole course of the life that now is, and of that which is to come.

It is quite enough for our purpose, however, to point out the direct, immediate, temporal advantages which may ensue from a judicious reform in the discipline of our prisons. The facts stated in these Reports afford abundant means of doing this, and, at the same time, hold out the most encouraging prospect of success as the reward of exertion. When the reform of the criminal code was adopted, which substituted imprisonment as the punishment for various crimes, instead of death, the pillory, or the scourge, arrangements were made, which, from want of sufficient attention to the great difficulties of the subject, or of that knowledge which perhaps experience alone could supply, were entirely inadequate to the end proposed; and instead of converting our jails into peniten-

tiaries, rendered them schools in which vice was taught with great ability and success. The unrestrained intercourse of the prisoners with each other, the want of classification, and the improper regulation of the intercourse of the officers with the prisoners, afforded facilities of corruption which were eagerly used by the abandoned inmates of those receptacles of crime; and every year great numbers were discharged from them, either by the expiration of the time for which they were sentenced, or by the frequently abused power of pardon, whose residence there had served no other purpose than to qualify and perhaps induce them to venture upon crimes which they had, previously, little inclination and little ability to commit. It was thought enough if these prisons could be made profitable in a pecuniary way to the Commonwealth; this, indeed, was regarded as the great test and criterion of the usefulness of the institution, — as if the crimes conceived, planned, and matured in those abodes of profligacy, would not levy a heavier tax on the community, than if their inmates had all been supported, in luxury, during their lives, by the treasure of the state.

As the saving of life, without increasing the burdens of society, was generally regarded as the great benefit to be derived from penitentiaries, productive labor naturally became the principal object of attention to the directors and officers of these institutions. Nothing or little else was thought of, than to make the labor of the convicts profitable; and if, by any extraordinary stimulus, more than was estimated as a fair day's-work could be obtained from them, the profits were reserved for themselves, or shared with their immediate supervisors. Thus, an intelligent, active young man might be thoroughly initiated into the arts and mysteries of iniquity by a few months' residence in the state prison, and be discharged with his education finished, his apprenticeship served, and a fund in his pocket against future accidents, or to be used as a means of procuring assistance or protection in his too probable course of crime. This need not be stated hypothetically. It is matter of history. It was well known to be so; and great was the fear and the sorrow felt by the philanthropic, lest it should eventually be necessary to give up the hope of any reform, and resort to the previous system of punishment, barbarous as it was, in preference to establishing, by public authority, schools of mutual corruption. The evils

of the penitentiary system, as it was called, were universally perceived to be enormous; they became too crying to be longer neglected; and wise and prudent men, in different parts of the country, began to turn their attention to the subject, and devise means of amending the whole system. The formation of the Prison Discipline Society has contributed in no small degree to this object. By its labors, or rather by those of its Secretary, who is its principal agent, by his personal investigations and unremitted industry, the secret mischiefs of the prison-house have been developed, whatever good has been effected has been made known, and many most valuable improvements have been introduced. Above all, the attention of the public, and especially of those who are in places of power, and therefore of responsibility, has been in some degree roused; the necessity of legislative interference and executive watchfulness has been demonstrated; and there is now reason to hope, that a fair trial of a truly penitentiary system may be made in many, if not all parts of our country. The intercourse between the prisoners will be restrained, and that between the officers and the convicts will be differently regulated. Silent solitude at night, silent labor by day, religious services daily and weekly, and elementary instruction to the ignorant, must produce a very different state of things in our prisons from what existed when instruction was neglected, silence was not enforced, and the daily and nightly communications of convicts were adapted to bring them all to one level of gross and shocking depravity.

To exhibit the progress which has been made in the improvement of state prisons, and the agency of this Society in introducing it, we propose to give a very brief table of the contents of the Reports which have been annually made by its Secretary. In the first, the best principles of the construction of prisons were pointed out, in relation to security, inspection, light, ventilation, cleanliness, and health. The proper regulations with regard to neatness, classification, diet, employment, and punishment were given; the comparative increase of the population of the country, and of crime, was stated, with the causes and remedies of many existing evils; and on all these subjects an already intimate acquaintance with them, and a clear perception of the proper course to be pursued, were manifested.

In the Second Report, the principal evils existing in the different penitentiaries were stated more in detail, and the necessary remedies were also dwelt upon. Very interesting accounts were given of the crimes which brought convicts to these places of punishment, and of those the taste for which they were likely to acquire there; of the system of mutual instruction in vice and roguery; of the mischief of confining together the old and the young, the lunatic and the sane; and of the great expense and the great mortality of some of the prisons. The necessity was shown of attention to the causes of crime, and the means of its increase; and the best methods of checking its growth within the prison walls were insisted on; such as, the selection of proper officers, constant employment by day and solitary confinement by night, silence at all times, and the opportunity for intellectual and religious instruction. A view of the condition of many of the prisons in the country was then given, most of which had been the subject of the personal inspection of the writer; and the list of them will show a diligence and perseverance worthy of all commendation. It comprises an account of the state prisons of Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, Massachusetts, Connecticut, New York City, Sing Sing, Auburn, New Jersey, Philadelphia, Pittsburg, Baltimore, Washington, Virginia, and a brief notice of those of Georgia, Kentucky, and Ohio.

In the Third Report, a statement was made, showing what had been done towards effecting a reform in many of the prisons before mentioned, providing instruction, and diminishing expenses; what prisons yet required improvement; and generally what had been accomplished, and what yet remained to be done in this great and good work. One very interesting table is given in this Report, of a considerable number of convicts, respecting whom inquiries were made after their discharge from the Auburn prison, where they had been subjected to the best existing system of discipline; and there is great reason to rejoice in the probability it shows, that the effect of that discipline was not lost, but in many instances exhibited itself in a permanent influence on their characters. But we intend to recur to this subject again.

In the Fourth Report, additional information was given with respect to what had been done in relation to the discipline of prisons; an abstract of the criminal law was added of the states of Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, Massachu-

setts, Rhode Island, Connecticut, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Delaware, Maryland, Virginia, and of the provisions of Mr. Livingston's code for Louisiana. The inequality of the laws, in these states, was pointed out, and the disproportion, in some of them, between the punishments for crimes of different degrees of atrocity. The importance of having the laws known and intelligible was also insisted on. Statements were then made, showing the direct and indirect effects of the labors of this Society.

In the Fifth and last Report, the history of reform in prisons was continued ; and that we may give to our readers, if there are any of them who have not perused these Reports, an idea of the nature of the reform desired and pursued, and of the business-like yet interesting manner in which all these papers are written, we shall extract that part of it which relates to the prison in Charlestown.

'In Massachusetts, the New Prison was finished and occupied during the last year. A competent witness, on the spot, says, a greater change was produced in the behaviour of the convicts, in a few weeks after they entered the solitude of the New Prison, than had been produced by the combined influence of all the causes which had been brought to bear upon it during the preceding year and a half.

'Soon after the new building containing the dormitories was completed, a small building, containing an apartment for the accommodation of a Sabbath School, was erected, where about fifty convicts of the younger class are instructed, on the Sabbath, under the immediate superintendence of the Chaplain.

'The Legislature, at the last session, having witnessed the progressive improvement in this Institution, authorized the erection of a new chapel. This chapel was commenced in April, and finished and dedicated to the service of Almighty God, in May. It is a very convenient, economical, and pleasant place of worship.

'These improvements in the buildings at Charlestown are not more worthy of notice than the improvement in discipline. This will be apparent from a brief statement of facts concerning it, arranged according to the division of time. From the locking up at night till morning light, all the convicts, except an average of about five in the hospital, are in the new building, in separate cells, and in cells so arranged, that a sentinel, on duty, can preserve entire silence among three hundred. The space around the cells being open from the ground to the roof, in front of four stories of cells, in a building two hundred feet in length, furnishes a perfect sounding gallery, in which the sentinel is placed, who can

hear a whisper from the most distant cell. He can therefore keep silence from the time of locking up at night to the time of unlocking in the morning, which, at some seasons of the year, makes more than one half of all the time, which is thus secured from evil communication. From the time of unlocking in the morning, about twelve minutes are occupied in a military movement of the convicts, in companies of thirty-eight, with an officer to each company, in perfect silence, to their various places of labor. At the end of about twelve minutes, it is found, that there is a place for every man, and every man in his place. This is as true of the officers as of the convicts. If an officer has occasion to leave his place, the system requires that a substitute be called. If a convict has occasion to leave his place, there is a token provided for each shop, or for a given number of men, so that from this shop or number only one convict can leave his place at a time. The consequence is, that with the exception of those who have the tokens in their hands, any officer of the Institution may be certain of finding, during the hours of labor, a place for every man, and every man in his place. There is, however, a class of men, consisting of ten or twelve, called *runners* and *lumpers*, whose duty consists in moving about the yard. But even their movements are in silence and order. Consequently, during the hours of labor, the convicts are never seen moving about the yard promiscuously, or assembled in little groups, in some hiding-places of mischief, or even two and two in common conversation. All is order and silence, except the busy hum of industry, during the hours of labor.

‘The hours of labor, in the morning, vary a little with the season of the year, but amount at this season to nearly two hours, from the time of unlocking in the morning till breakfast. When the hour for breakfast comes, almost in an instant, the convicts are all seen marching in solid and silent columns, with the lock step, under their respective officers, from the shops to the cells. On their way to the cells, they pass the cookery, where the food, having been made ready, is handed to them, as they pass along; and at the end of about twelve minutes from the time of ringing the bell for breakfast, all the convicts are in their cells, eating their breakfast, silently and alone. One officer only is left in charge, to preserve silence; and the others are as free from solicitude and care, till the hour of labor returns, as other citizens.

‘When the time of labor again returns, which is at the end of about twenty-five minutes, almost in an instant, the whole body of convicts are again seen marching as before to their places of labor. On their way to the shops, they pass through the chapel, and attend prayers. The time from breakfast till dinner passes away like the time for labor before breakfast, all the convicts being

found in their places industriously employed, in silence. The time assigned for dinner is filled up in the same manner as the time assigned for breakfast; and the time for labor in the afternoon, in the same manner as the time for labor in the morning; and when the time for evening prayers has come, at the ringing of the bell, all the convicts, and all the officers not on duty elsewhere, are seen marching to the chapel, where the Chaplain closes the day with reading the Scriptures and prayer. After which the convicts march with perfect silence and order to their cells, taking their supper as they pass along. In about five and twenty minutes from the time of leaving their labor, the convicts have attended prayers in the chapel, taken their supper, marched to their cells with their supper in their hands, and are safely locked up for the night. This is the history of a day at Charlestown; and the history of a day is the history of a year, with the variations which are made, on the Sabbath, by dispensing with the hours of labor, and substituting the hours for instruction in the Sabbath School, and the hours for public worship.

‘We offer a single remark in regard to this statement, concerning the discipline of the Prison at Charlestown. It is the Auburn system well introduced; and what has been done at Charlestown can be done elsewhere.

‘If, now, the present Warden shall be as successful, in the management of the Institution, in securing favorable pecuniary results, as he has been in introducing the new discipline, he will show himself to be an invaluable public officer. He merits and receives great praise for what he has already done.’—pp. 336 – 338.

The greater part of the last Report is taken up with statements of facts and opinions on the subject of imprisonment for debt, and an abstract of the laws of several of the states on this subject. The Secretary has taken great pains to obtain a correct expression of public opinion on this topic, by addressing letters to many individuals in different parts of the country, some of whose names are among the most distinguished we have to boast, requesting their views in relation to it. The unanimity of their abhorrence of the present operation of the laws of debtor and creditor is not surprising, and we hope soon to see the effect of the expression of the opinions of such men in a thorough reform of our system. Ancient as is the custom of imprisoning for debt, and it is among the most so of all the punishments on record, there can be no doubt in the minds of those who will attend to the subject, or read this Report, that it is, at the present day, inadequate to the end proposed, morally injurious to both parties, and

every way injurious to the indebted, unequal in its operation upon different classes of debtors, dreadfully cruel to those who are dependent, perhaps for their daily bread, upon the daily labor of their imprisoned husband or father, unworthy of those whose boast it is that they would not barter their political, still less their personal freedom for gold, and in the highest degree unbecoming in those who pray for the forgiveness of their debts, as they forgive their debtors. What remedy is to be applied to the multiplied evils of the existing system, we cannot undertake to determine; but sure we are, that some change must be made in one which is at variance with the judgment and feelings of the better part of the community, and with the principles of the religion by which we profess to be guided. Public opinion is manifestly in favor of an alteration of the laws on the subject; and the sooner our legislatures adopt those measures which will satisfy that public opinion, the better will be the evidence of their justice, patriotism, and humanity. In the mean time the attention of the public, of those who in fact direct the measures which the government, in this country, necessarily follow, ought to be turned to the question; and we glad are that the Prison Discipline Society have done so much to this purpose. We trust that it will also use its efforts for the introduction of a system of discipline in our county jails, corresponding to that which is so valuable in the penitentiaries. The evils arising from the improper construction of the buildings, insufficient discipline, the want of religious instruction and moral influence, are scarcely less in these places than in the state prisons; and still greater numbers are exposed to the contamination of evil communications and idleness.* The same, or similar remedies are necessary; and we hope that the pursuit will never be given up, till every jail in the country shall exhibit the good effects of a wise benevolence, and become a place where the guilty may not merely be punished, but where their faults may be corrected and their lives amended.

But we sometimes hear it said, and by those whose opinions are entitled to respect, that all hope of reforming the

* The 'Letter' addressed, about a year ago, by the Rev. Dr. Tuckerman to the Mayor of Boston, respecting the House of Correction and the common jail of the city, proves the existence of the same evils there, which have been discovered in the penitentiaries.

hardened criminals of our prisons is entirely visionary, the mere enthusiasm of benevolent men. 'Do you expect,' say they, 'to abolish crime? Can you change the skin of the *Æthiopian*, or the spots of the leopard? The utmost that can be effected is to save society from crime, by confining the perpetrators of it; and if their labor can be made to support them, the public will realize the great advantage of safety from dangerous subjects without expense, and without wounding the feelings or conscience of those who object to capital punishments. As this is all that can be done, it would be better not to attempt any thing else.'

Is it so? Can even this be done without attempting something more? In order to effect it, every offender of whatever degree of criminality that deserves the punishment of imprisonment, must be confined for life, or society is not safe from his criminal propensities. And can this be done? Would this be justice? If not confined for life, the public must be, at some time or other, again exposed to his depredations, with an appetite sharpened by his compulsory abstinence, and stimulated by the desire of vengeance upon the authors of his suffering. He would, at the same time, be better qualified for his trade of villany, by the acquaintance he must have gained with the arts of his associates, unless his intercourse with them were restrained by something more than the necessity of performing a daily task. There is another error involved in the reasoning we have just stated. It rests on the supposition, that every individual sent to a prison as a criminal is a thorough-bred, hardened, unchangeable villain; than which few suppositions, as we are glad to believe, have less foundation in fact. Hundreds have been sent there at so early a period of their lives, that however shocking specimens they may have been of youthful depravity, it is hardly conceivable that their habits of iniquity could have become so fixed as to be incorrigible under a wholesome, judicious, and kind discipline. Thousands have been sent there, whose ignorance was so deplorable, as almost to equal that of the *Ninevites* of old; and if in such blackness of intellectual darkness they have lost the path of virtue, is it hopeless that they will regain it, when the dawning light of knowledge and religion shall arise to guide them? Others have been sent there, who have fallen into crime from perhaps a single, strong, unexpected temptation, which they were not prepared

to resist, but the consequences of which have already awakened penitential feelings within them, that require only opportunity for reflection and the aid of friendly counsel, warning and admonition, to ripen into the fruits of good living; but would soon be drowned and overwhelmed in the ridicule, and corrupting intercourse of more profligate companions.

The truth is, that the number is comparatively small of those, who by the abuse of opportunities, the advantages of circumstance or education, have hardened themselves into incorrigible and desperate offenders. And even of this small class, why should it be thought a thing incredible that God should raise the dead in trespasses and sins to a new and better life? What should prevent us from at least making the attempt? Is it too costly an undertaking? It costs nothing. The discipline, the moral influence which we desire to introduce, are the very best means of making the prison profitable. But supposing it were costly, will any man weigh the value of character against dollars and cents? The reformation of a single impenitent inhabitant of those gloomy walls were worth more than all the expense, the pains, the prayers, that have been, or will be bestowed upon them; and there should be, and there is, on earth, as well as in heaven, 'joy over one sinner that repenteth.' Is it an undertaking so utterly desperate and hopeless, that it is not worth while to labor for it? We think not. We have already pointed out some reasons for hoping that many might be reclaimed, or at least improved, by the use of suitable means; and we are happy to be able to show that those hopes are confirmed by experience. Such means have been used, and, by the blessing of God, they have not been without success. In the Third Report of the Prison Discipline Society there is a table (23d page of the 2d edition) containing the initials and general character of one hundred and sixty convicts, as they were known to be before their imprisonment, and as they were found after they had been discharged from the Auburn prison, 'by inquiries directed to post-masters, sheriffs, district attorneys, and other public officers.' Of that number, 'a hundred and twelve are described as decidedly steady and industrious, or very greatly improved; and twelve as somewhat reformed.' More than three quarters of those discharged, therefore, were better men and better members of society than when convicted.

We were much struck with the number of those mentioned in this table, as having partially or entirely corrected habits of intemperance ; not merely because this propensity is one of the most difficult to reform, but because there is a direct connexion between intemperance and crime, which we think has not been so much attended to as it deserves to be. The natural effect of intemperance in producing poverty, and thus increasing the temptations to vice, has often been remarked and very forcibly shown. But we believe, that many a crime has been committed in a fit of intoxication, from which the unhappy perpetrator would have shrunk with horror in the sober possession of his faculties. The maxim of the law, that a state of drunkenness is no excuse for the offence, is doubtless a just and necessary one ; but can we regard as equally guilty in a moral view, the cold-blooded, deliberate murderer, and him who, in a drunken brawl, strikes a blow, the force of which he is no longer in a condition to measure ? Can we avoid some commiseration for the feelings of surprise, mortification, and horror of one who, perhaps not habitually vicious, first awakes to a sober consciousness of having exposed himself to ignominious, or capital punishment, in the confusion of an inebriated brain ? We do not wish to excuse the guilt of the drunkard, nor to excite sympathy in his favor ; but we desire to point to an argument, which we think might be used with more effect than it has been, to impress upon the inconsiderate the horrible dangers to which the loss of the controlling power of reason exposes them.

Another fact, shown by this table, appears to us important. It is the large proportion of those sentenced for passing or making counterfeit money. No less than thirty-four out of a hundred and sixty, or more than one fifth of the whole number of convicts, were imprisoned for this offence ; and as this is one, the temptations to which are particularly increased by the institutions of our society, we are doubly bound to take heed not to place such stumbling-blocks unnecessarily in the way of the weak in virtuous principle. By a list of altered and counterfeit bank notes given in the Second Report (page 25), it is shown that the greater part of these notes are of small denominations, generally of less than five dollars, rarely exceeding that sum. The system on which banking operations have been carried on among us has multiplied prodigiously the number of notes of these small

amounts, and thus greatly increased the temptation and the facility of counterfeiting. This is far from being the only ill consequence of small bills. They have withdrawn a great amount of the precious metals from circulation; and therefore have a strong tendency to the injury of the poorer classes of the community, among whom their use is most common, and upon whom principally the loss must fall, in the case either of the bills being counterfeited, or the bank becoming insolvent. In the states of New York and Pennsylvania, the banks are now prohibited from circulating bills below the denomination of five dollars; and the effect of this regulation, as we are informed, is manifestly good. We hope, as the period for renewing bank charters in this Commonwealth is approaching, our legislature may be induced to follow the example which has been set by other states, and thus greatly promote the good of the community, at a very trifling sacrifice on the part of the banks. The profit derived from the circulation of small bills is an inconsiderable item in their accounts; it is a privilege for which they certainly would not pay any large sum; and it would not be the least benefit of adopting such a regulation, that the number of convicts in our prisons would in all probability be materially diminished.

In the Fourth Report (pages 23, 24, of the 2d edition) we have the following statement;

‘Intelligence has been received, during the last year, in answer to letters addressed to post-masters and sheriffs, in all parts of the state of New York, concerning two hundred and six discharged convicts; of whom one hundred and forty-six are reformed. Concerning many of the hundred and forty-six here mentioned, information has been received three years in succession, giving them the same character; and some of them the character of decidedly pious men. Three years ago, this system of inquiry concerning discharged convicts was first instituted. The first year, it brought favorable returns concerning fifty-two; the second year, concerning one hundred and twelve; and the third year, as already stated, concerning one hundred and forty-six.

‘There is another class of facts proving the same thing concerning the reformatory character of the prison at Auburn. The recommitments in 1827, out of four hundred and twenty-seven, were only nineteen. And in 1829, out of five hundred and seventy, only seventeen.’ — pp. 257, 258.

Again we have evidence, and of course stronger evidence than before, as another year had passed, of the benefit actu-

ally conferred on the convict, and on society by the discipline of the prison. The proportion of those improved is as great as before. Nor do we perceive that this evidence is in any way impeachable. District attorneys and sheriffs do not usually belong to those classes of persons who might be suspected of any bias in favor of discharged convicts, nor are they commonly liable to any suspicion of a visionary or enthusiastic turn of mind. On the contrary, they are generally men who are not easily imposed upon by any of the tricks or deceptions of the worst portion of society, and who would be rather slow than otherwise to believe in the reformation of those whom they had known to be convicted of infamous crimes. Who shall say, after this, that the reformation of the criminals of our prisons is a hopeless attempt? If a twentieth part of the number reported as improved, in the short space of time since the introduction of the better system of discipline, had been so described by the persons to whom application was made, we should have taken encouragement as to the possibility of success upon a longer and fairer trial; but to have such a return within three years, affords not merely encouragement, but the certainty of so great a degree of success as renders it incumbent upon the public to provide, at once, the necessary means of producing such reforms. There is no excuse for delay. The experiment has been tried, and has resulted in the best good of society, and of those who are temporarily secluded from it.

But we may be met, perhaps, by an objection of an opposite kind. 'If the good to be obtained and the means of obtaining it are so clear and certain, why all this earnestness? Why call so strongly upon every one to do what is manifestly for his interest? State your case, and prove your facts, and it will be enough. All will then be as ready as you could wish, to adopt so desirable a system.' If this were always so, improvements would proceed with a much more rapid pace than we find they usually do. And perhaps it is not desirable that they should be so easily attained. Obstacles are not wanting to this, more than to other decided improvements which are from time to time suggested. In the first place, there is no small class of persons interested in perpetuating the old system of things; and from them opposition in every form is to be expected, and is found. Already has the indefatigable agent of this society encountered, in his attempts at

reform in three different states, opposition the most determined, misrepresentation, personal abuse, and slander; and some of the statements of facts in the last Annual Report have called forth similar obloquy from another quarter. Besides this, there is a *vis inertiae* in the public mind, which it generally requires no small effort to overcome; and the subject of prison discipline forms no exception to this remark. Important as it is in all its bearings, public attention has been by no means adequately called to it as yet. Much remains to be done on this point; and it is not by one nor by a few insulated efforts, that this object can be attained. Dr. Tuckerman's Letter to the Mayor of Boston last year, to which we have referred, contained appalling statements with regard to the condition and discipline of those confined in the House of Correction and jail; yet the public was little excited by them, and the letter itself has not been extensively read. Almost every grand jury, also, whose duty it is to inspect the county jails, has become acquainted with facts which might have excited attention, had they been properly stated, and sufficiently repeated.*

* To show the imperious necessity of immediate and active attention to this subject of prison discipline, we add the following extract from a late New York paper, which confirms in the strongest manner some of the remarks we have made.

'*New York, Jan. 8.* — We have no institutions more flourishing than our prisons. It is but a few years since the State Prison at Auburn was erected, with five hundred cells, and it is now full to overflowing; the number of inmates being six hundred and sixteen. The number of prisoners at Sing Sing is eight hundred and six. Total 1422; showing an increase during the past year of one hundred ninety-four; and this, notwithstanding seventy-six have been pardoned by the Executive. Provision has been made for the erection of two hundred additional cells in the prison at Sing Sing, and even these, if we reason from the past, will scarcely suffice for another year. "It is evident," says Governor Throop in his late Message, "that our prisons must be enlarged without delay." Of the prisoners at Sing Sing who have "entered" during the past year, *one hundred and fourteen* are from the City of New York. And yet the number of villains among us is not perceptibly diminished!

'The fact is, that this city has become a sort of catch-all for rogues and vagabonds from every part of the country, and indeed from many foreign countries; and although our law-mills are kept constantly in operation, the consumption is not greater than the supply. Far be it from us to libel the general character of our population; which is probably not surpassed in moral excellence by any city of equal magnitude on the globe. But at the same time, the facts above stated are

There is a great work well begun. Enough has been accomplished to prove its practicability and value; but those who are engaged in it require all the encouragement and support which they can find in the favorable regard of the better part of the community. 'It is no trifling matter,' as has been in substance well observed in another place, — 'it is no trifling matter to be exposed, as reformers often are, to the sneering charge of a visionary, enthusiastic character. Still less is it a trifle to be publicly misrepresented, injuriously accused, slandered, calumniated. No man can be envied for this, and more than this, to which the attempt at great improvements often exposes him; and when we see any one willing to step forward to sweep away old abuses, to encounter the storm of obloquy and persecution raised by those who are interested to perpetuate them, we cannot but say from our hearts, God speed him, and God bless him.' We trust that great success is to be the ultimate and not distant result of the labors of this Society, and its unwearied, judicious, devoted agent. When we look back upon what has been done in this immense field, by the wise and assiduous efforts of a single individual, in the course of a few years, we are greatly encouraged with regard to the future prospect, and we hope his hands and his heart will be strengthened in the great work he has undertaken. We shall not offer any counsel as to the best modes of correcting evils, or introducing improvements. Those who are engaged in the pursuit understand these things far better than we can pretend to do; but we will express our hope that they will be deterred by no difficulty, misrepre-

undeniable and appalling. They admonish us to make use of every possible means as well for the prevention as the punishment of crime. Much is to be expected from the influence of Sabbath Schools; which, though of comparatively modern date, have already done much to preserve the real population of the city in a healthy state. Scarcely an instance is on record, of an individual who has enjoyed the benefit of Sunday School instruction, being convicted of a heinous offence against the laws. The promotion of temperance, so far as it extends, is another important item in the means of preventing crime; since it is a truth, to which all our magistrates can bear witness, that much the greater part of the cases that come under their cognizance, are either directly or indirectly the consequence of intemperance. It is therefore the interest of our citizens, as they regard their own safety and that of their families and property, to encourage these laudable undertakings, and every other instrumentality which has for its object the promotion of good morals and the eradication of vicious propensities.' — *Journal of Commerce.*

sentation, or obloquy from continuing the course upon which they have entered. Let them pursue it, as they have begun, with an energy and perseverance worthy of the cause, till every prison shall be converted into a house of reform, and punishment shall be regarded more in relation to the security of society and its future effect upon the character, than to its bearing upon past delinquencies.

ART. III. — *A Collection of Psalms and Hymns for Christian Worship.* Boston. Carter & Hendee. 1830. 18mo.

THE greatest perfection to which religious poetry has yet been carried is in the 'Psalms of David.' The history of David gives more than its usual truth to the maxim, that the first successful efforts in any kind of composition have commonly an absolute excellence, and all succeeding works have an inferior comparative merit. The Bible was translated into English at a time, however unfavorable for the pure transmission of its doctrine, the most favorable in the history of the language, for its poetry. Without entering on the question of inspiration, or being too curious as to the causes of their power, we probably give the opinion of most Christians in giving our own, that these strains, through the medium of the plain English translation, do make a deeper impression on the heart, than any other religious poetry, ancient or modern. They are older than criticism, and have all the merits of that age. The images with which they abound are taken directly from nature and not borrowed from older poets, and are the proper garment of the thoughts. It is the poetry of a lover of nature in the morning of civilization. Civilization operates to draw men within doors, and to fix their eyes so much on works of art, as to hide the mountain and the desert and the sea. Then the love of nature is increased, and a higher interest given to the Psalm by the love of God. The most remarkable merit of this poetry certainly is, the lively and affectionate conception of God, which seems to imply of necessity the truth of the Jewish history, and, with whatever injurious errors it is coupled, is far the most distinct and affecting description of the Deity that is to be found, out of the New Testament and writings indebted to it.

This body of poetry has always commended itself to the Christian church as the best vehicle of devotional feeling down to a recent age. In the time of Henry the Eighth, Sternhold and Hopkins turned them into English verse; and it is a singular instance of the force of association, that the love of David could reconcile Milton to the wretchedness of the English version, and imprison even his genius in the same mean stanza. His paraphrases of some of the Psalms are still retained in the editions of his *Minor Poems*. It may be remarked also, that Lord Bacon had written some of the same doggrel, and so had Dr. Henry More, another of the great writers of the age of Elizabeth.

The maxim of ancient philosophy, that 'the same can only be known by the same,' may be well applied to these attempts to present the Psalms in an English metre. They require a mind of kindred character to the Psalmist. Dr. Watts has excelled all his tuneful brethren in this work, because to great power of numbers he added a very fervent piety. But it was found that the best rendering of the Psalter, however useful as a book of devotion, could very imperfectly express the wants and feelings of a modern assembly. An unwarrantable perversion of the national and local imagery of David had become necessary to give it any kind of accommodation to the present state of the Christian church. It was far better to let it sing its own songs. For this reason Hymns began to be written. We shall always regret that this class of compositions, now so important by the considerable place it fills in our public worship, did not fall into better hands. It is not fit that men of common powers should write our hymns. If every hymn to be sung in our churches could have come from the powerful and hallowed minds that have thought for the human race, and instead of being regarded as an occasional and inferior exercise, had been the vent of their best and deepest contemplations upon God and nature, these minds would have enjoyed an influence which will never be granted to their epics and books of philosophy or criticism. It is the well known saying of a distinguished statesman, 'Let who will make the laws of a people; give me the making of their songs.' So it is not the Bodies of Divinity, nor the ablest religious works, whether in prose or verse, that can ever hope to enter into the heart and faith of a nation, like the familiar religious song that is in their mouth

every Sunday, aided in its effect by the reverence of the Bible, the power of music, the associations of the place, and the sympathy of a congregation. Milton should have written hymns for those who speak the English tongue ; and whatsoever sublime bard has sung to any people, could best have instructed them by doing this office.

But whilst we say what might have been done, and what we hope will yet be done, we do not undervalue the simple and pious strains which are now used in the church, bequeathed to us by so many excellent men. Many of our hymns possess great merit, and the Collection which has called our attention to this subject, has shown us that this department of sacred literature is richer than we supposed. Every lover of religious poetry probably thinks he can make a better hymn-book than any one he has seen ; but our own confidence in this proposition has been somewhat shaken by the examination of Mr. Greenwood's work. It contains five hundred and sixty hymns, selected with taste and judgment from various and some of them rather unfrequented sources. It is both older and newer than other works of the same kind, inasmuch as it contains more of the ancient hymns than former compilations, whilst it is enriched by many selections from Bishop Heber, and from Montgomery and other living poets. It is an excellence of this book, that it contains a large number of hymns composed in a strain of fervent piety and peculiarly adapted to Christian worship. Of this character are the hymns selected from the Moravian and the Methodist Collections. We quote the following verses, which are taken from Wesley's Collection.

‘ My God, my strength, my hope,
On thee I cast my care,
With humble confidence look up,
And know thou hear'st my prayer.
Give me on thee to wait,
Till I can all things do ;
On thee, almighty to create,
Almighty to renew.

‘ I want a sober mind,
A self-renouncing will
That tramples down and casts behind
The baits of pleasing ill ;

A soul inured to pain,
To hardship, grief, and loss,
Bold to take up, firm to sustain
The consecrated cross.

‘I want a godly fear,
A quick discerning eye,
That looks to thee when sin is near,
And sees the tempter fly ;
A spirit still prepared,
And armed with jealous care,
For ever standing on its guard,
And watching unto prayer.

‘I want a true regard,
A single, steady aim,
Unmoved by threatening or reward,
To thee and thy great name ;
A zealous, just concern
For thine immortal praise ;
A pure desire that all may learn
And glorify thy grace.’ — *Hymn 284.*

We are very glad to find the fine hymn from Cowper, beginning

‘To keep the lamp alive,
With oil we fill the bowl ;
‘T is water makes the willow thrive,
And grace that feeds the soul.

‘The Lord’s unsparing hand
Supplies the living stream ;
It is not at our own command,
But still derived from him.’ — *Hymn 323.*

There are some hymns of that decided merit that pleases every taste. The noble ‘Te Deum’ of Patrick, the versions of Addison or Marvell ; Miss Williams’s Hymn, entitled ‘Devotion ;’ Mrs. Barbauld’s version of Habakkuk, iii. 17 — 19 ; the best known verses of Watts and of Doddridge ; and the fine old hymn, annually sung to the tune of St. Martin’s in University Hall at Cambridge, — ‘Give ear, my children, to my law,’ &c., are of this class ; and, except the last, which we are sorry to miss, are retained in the present Collection. Most of those hymns which every lover of psalmody looks for, he will probably find. It is, in our eyes, an addi-

tional recommendation of this book, that the interpolations which have been thrust into the hymns of Watts and Doddridge, sometimes making the dead and defenceless poet say what he would abhor to say, are here exchanged for the genuine readings. And besides the justice, the poetry commonly gains by the restoration. The following beautiful verses of Watts, among others, are restored to their original simplicity and pathos.

- ‘ Welcome, sweet day of rest,
That saw the Lord arise ;
Welcome to this reviving breast,
And these rejoicing eyes !
- ‘ The King himself comes near,
And feasts his saints to-day ;
Here we may sit, and see him here,
And love, and praise, and pray.
- ‘ One day amidst the place
Where my dear Lord hath been,
Is sweeter than ten thousand days
Of pleasurable sin.
- ‘ My willing soul would stay
In such a frame as this ;
And sit and sing herself away
To everlasting bliss.’ — *Hymn 26.*

ART. IV. — PROFESSOR STUART’S *Appendix* to his *Exegetical Essays on several Words relating to Future Punishment*.
Andover. 1830. 12mo.

[A Letter.]

SINCE the publication of my Letter in the Examiner for September, 1830, I have seen Professor Stuart’s Appendix to his ‘ Exegetical Essays on several Words relating to Future Punishment.’ In this Appendix, he offers remarks on the Letter above mentioned ; from which remarks, I make the following extract ; — ‘ He [the present writer] still maintains (p. 26), as he first did, that “ *αἰών* means *spirituality*, in the more ancient Greek,” and that “ the Seventy probably used it in a kindred sense in their version.”

‘In opposition to this, I shall merely state, that no *classic* Lexicon within the range of my consultation, gives such a sense to the word. Passow’s Lexicon, the last and best of all, does not even advert to it. I have never met with it in any classic Greek writer; and consequently I must believe, that no such meaning ever was attached to it in ancient Greek, until I see some *evidence* of it; for no evidence has Mr. G. even attempted to offer.’

A few years ago, this declaration from Professor Stuart, would have been, in my mind, proof positive, and all-sufficient, that the sense of αἰών in question could not be found in any classic Lexicon of authority, or in any classic Greek writer. I should have believed, at once, that no meaning ever existed in so important a word, which had not met the eye of this distinguished critic. I doubt not, there are many, to whom the above declaration will now come with a similar influence. His name is great, and deservedly so; and his mere declaration, ‘I have never seen this or that meaning, in this or that important word,’ is equivalent, throughout a very extensive portion of the theological world, to a positive assertion, and trustworthy evidence, that no such meaning exists, or ever has existed, in the term in question. I speak thus, not wholly from speculation, but in a good measure from personal experience. Most cheerfully do I confess myself indebted for many valuable views of scriptural truth, to hints suggested, and to statements made in his publications. My confidence in his learning, integrity, and spiritual power has been scarcely surpassed by that of the personal disciple who sitteth at his feet. But, in the present case, I differ from him entirely; and his above-quoted declaration comes to me with a very different aspect, and conveys a very different impression, from what it would once have done. I see in it, now, no further evidence, that a sense of *spirituality* was not attached to αἰών in the more ancient Greek, than that one eminent critic has never seen it. I receive his words, above produced, as simply a magnanimous confession, that he does not know of any such meaning in the word; an honorable assurance of his readiness to hear evidence upon the subject; and by implication, a high-minded promise, that, if competent evidence be produced, he will believe.

I quote further from the same Appendix the following ; — ‘In page 25 *seq.*, Mr. G. argues, after all, that the principal ground of investigating the true apostolic use of *αἰώνιος*, is the use of it by the Seventy, who regarded it as being correspondent to the Hebrew עולם. I accept the terms of contest here proposed, at once, and enter the lists with entire readiness.’ Whether Professor Stuart has quoted my exact words, or not, is of but little consequence. If I apprehend him right, he has stated my true meaning, and marked out a fair field. I enter it willingly ; and take up the gage as readily as he has thrown it down. Let it be ascertained in what sense the Seventy employed *αἰών* or *αἰώνιος*, and then it is granted that these words were employed in similar meanings in the New Testament ; with the proper allowance for the difference of time, circumstance, and change of language, between the Seventy and the Apostles. On this ground, I am willing to meet the struggle, and abide the issue.

The true object, therefore, is, to investigate the sense, in which the Seventy made use of *αἰών* or *αἰώνιος*, in their version of the Scriptures. But how is this investigation to be made? Certainly not by merely appealing to the meaning assigned to עולם, by the Lexicons, and then arguing, as a thing of course, that the Seventy must have employed *αἰών* and *αἰώνιος* in the same sense. These Lexicons themselves are but works of yesterday, compared with the Septuagint. They are continually appealing to that volume for evidence of the correctness of their own definitions of the Hebrew words corresponding to its Greek words. It is one of the principal authorities on which they rely for the support of their own definitions. ‘And without all contradiction, the *less* is blessed of the greater.’ Of as great value, therefore, as the Lexicons are, the Greek Scriptures are greater than they. The Greek Scriptures are, in effect, the most valuable Lexicon of ancient Hebrew now extant.

In order to ascertain the sense in which the Seventy made use of *αἰών* or *αἰώνιος*, in their version, the appeal must be made, in the first instance, to the meaning of the words in the ordinary Greek of their age. For they would not have made use of them for translating עולם, unless they believed that this Hebrew word sustained a sense similar to that which they sustained in Greek. It would be an unjust and cruel reproach upon their moral honesty, to believe otherwise ; for

it would be charging them with an intention to deceive their readers; which is not to be admitted.

Should it however be supposed, or even suspected, that they employed these Greek words in their version, in some peculiar Hebrew sense; then an ultimate appeal must be made to the Hebrew Scriptures themselves, for the true meaning of עולם, to be afterwards reflected back upon αἰών and αἰώνιος, according to the circumstances of each individual instance. But, in that case, the investigation must be made on the principle which Professor Stuart has followed in investigating the meaning of שאול [Sheol]. 'I have,' he says, 'simply followed, as my custom is, the *Concordance*, and endeavoured, in each case, to determine the meaning of the word שאול, from the connexion in which it stands.' The same custom must, sooner or later, be followed in regard to עולם; a method of investigation, of which the result is not to be feared. But the present concern is with αἰών and αἰώνιος, as employed by the Seventy; and the first object must be to ascertain the meaning of these words in the ordinary Greek of their age. For the meaning of the words in such Greek is *primâ facie* evidence of the sense in which they are employed in the Greek Scriptures.

Before proceeding further in this inquiry, it may be well, if not necessary, to state, that I assume, as correct, the following particulars;—

1. The date of the *volume*, called the Septuagint,* may be assigned at not far from three hundred years before Christ; perhaps a little later, but not so much so as to have any material influence, at least in the present inquiry.

2. Portions of the Scriptures were translated into Greek at an earlier period than the above; probably, not long after the return from the Babylonish captivity, for the use of the Jews 'scattered abroad' among nations speaking Greek.

3. The Pentateuch was the earliest translated.

4. The earlier translations were probably embodied into the volume, and together with the later ones, compose the book now called the Septuagint.

5. The term, THE SEVENTY, in reality means no more than

* The whole subject of the Septuagint, its date, &c., is amply and satisfactorily discussed in Prideaux' *Connection*, Vol. III. Part II. Book i.

the *persons* who translated any part of the Scriptures into Greek, and whose translations are preserved in the Septuagint; whether they performed their portion of the work at an earlier or a later date; whether they were solitary individuals, or associated in a body.

6. These translators were Greek *scholars*. Jews or Gentiles, they must have been acquainted with Greek literature; or they could not have been competent to the work of translation.

7. In translating, they made use of Greek words in a classical sense wherever they could.

8. In selecting a Greek word to represent a Hebrew word, they selected one which sustained, in true Greek, a general meaning, as near as might be, to the sense which they believed to exist in the Hebrew word.

9. In translating a Hebrew word sustaining several meanings, they selected for the purpose, as nearly as possible, a Greek term sustaining the same different senses.

10. Their Greek words ought to be understood in their classical sense, unless it should be in evidence that they employed them, in the instances in question, in some peculiar Hebrew-Greek sense; due allowance being made for the different idiom of the two languages, and for those shades of difference which exist in words most nearly correspondent to each other in different languages.

11. The Seventy *uniformly* employ *αἰών* or *αἰώνιος* to represent what they understood *עולם* to signify in Hebrew; so uniformly, that to all purposes of the present investigation it may be said they *always* do so.

12. There are terms in the Greek language which express *eternity* and *eternal*, besides *αἰών* and *αἰώνιος*, whether these latter express these ideas or not. But those other terms are never employed in translating *עולם*.

I do not believe that any of the above propositions will be denied. They have, indeed, more the air of truisms than of postulates. Should you however doubt any of them, lay aside whatever argument may be founded on what is doubted, until you see the evidence in its support; and if the evidence be not satisfactory, reject such argument altogether. For the present I assume them as granted premises, and arrive at the following state of the case;—The Seventy met

with the word עולם in the Hebrew Scriptures ; they selected *αἰών* and *αἰώνιος*, as the proper terms by which to translate it ; they adhered to these words for this purpose with a scrupulous pertinacity. The inference is direct, that they believed this Hebrew term to bear an import, as nearly equal to that of these Greek words in classical Greek, as the idiom of the two languages would admit. Whatever then was the import of *αἰών* or *αἰώνιος* in true Greek in their age, we must believe that such was the meaning of עולם in their minds, and (considering their favorable circumstances) that such was its true meaning, with proper allowances as above stated.

As the adjective *αἰώνιος* depends entirely for its meaning on the noun *αἰών*, I shall, for this and another reason, hereafter to be assigned, make no further mention at present of *αἰώνιος*, but shall speak of the noun alone, as comprehending both. You will be satisfied of the propriety of so doing hereafter.

The main object now is, to ascertain the meaning of *αἰών* in true Greek, in the days of the Seventy. There are three principal sources of evidence on this subject ; namely, *etymology*, *lexicography*, and the actual *usage* of this word as it occurs in writers of their times, and those writers of preceding ages, whose works were then extant, and were among the still approved classics then in common use.

As I shall have frequent occasion to mention Greek writers and writings of a date anterior to that of the Seventy, or of their times, I will take the liberty to call such writers and writings and the Greek of those ages by the name *ancient*, in contradistinction to those of subsequent ages.

I have asserted, in substance, and I now repeat it distinctly, that *αἰών*, in *ancient* Greek, sustained, among other meanings, a sense of *spirituality*. It signified *the principle of life*, *vitality*, *the breath*, *the spirit*. These are not the only meanings of *αἰών*, but they are among its meanings. It is requisite for me to prove the above assertions ; and it is my present purpose to present such evidence as I have. In doing this, I shall be led to take a view of the general conditions and habits of this word, among the existing writings of those periods. And, if the discussion have no other effect, it may at least do something towards elucidating the meanings which *αἰών* did sustain in those periods ; some of which meanings are scarcely alluded to by modern writers, and are not even hinted at by Professor Stuart.

My FIRST evidence for a sense of spirituality in *αἰών* is ETYMOLOGY. The etymology of *αἰών* as obviously assigns it a *spiritual* sense, as does that of any Greek word whatever, employed in a spiritual meaning. The Greek language is well known to pay great respect to the etymology of its terms; as much so, perhaps, as the Hebrew itself. There is scarce a word in ancient Greek which may not be clearly traced to its root, and have the general cast of its character discovered thereby. In investigating the meaning of *αἰών*, therefore, its derivation is a matter of much consequence, and ought to be ascertained in the beginning. It will, at least, afford much help in showing what its meaning may be expected to be.

It has often been affirmed, that *αἰών* is compounded of *ἀεὶ* and *ὢν*, which words are usually understood to signify *always existing*.* Concerning the component terms of this word there is some doubt. It may have been thus composed; or it may have arisen more immediately from the verb *ἄω*, and more naturally than have been formed by the composition of two terms. But admitting that the component terms are correctly stated, still the meaning commonly assigned to *αἰών* from its supposed origin is very doubtful.

Lennepe, in his 'Etymologicum Linguae Græcæ,' gives some account of *αἰών* and words connected with it, from which I will make some extracts; believing that the etymology of this word and its cognates cannot be better presented, than in the words of this distinguished critic, or his coadjutor and editor, translated into English as follows.

'*ἄω, flo, spiro,*' [to blow, to breathe.]

'*Ἀεὶ, semper,* [*always*.] Its origin is the verb *ἄω*, [*flo, spiro*, to blow, to breathe]. 'But it seems, that from the sense of *breathing*, in very many derivatives of this verb, a transfer has been made to *duration of time*.'—'But *ἀεὶ* is, properly, a sort of ancient *dative* of the masculine noun *ἄεϊς*, in place of which the more lengthened form *ἀεῖς* has given rise to the *neuter* *αἰέν* in same manner as *ἐν* is formed from *εἷς*. But *αἰέν* and *αἰεὶ*, in the poets, is the same as *ἀεὶ* in vulgar use, *semper*' [*always*].—'The root is *ἄω*, properly, *to breathe*, &c. Therefore *ἀεὶ* is, properly, *by a breathing* [*spiratione*], that is, *gentle procession*, and sort of *perpetual efflux*

* It is not improbable that this opinion concerning the composition of *αἰών*, has been admitted in consequence of what has been thought to be the meaning of Aristotle, *De Cælo*, lib. i. cap. 9, which passage will be hereafter produced, and can speak for itself.

of time, and so *duration* not *interrupted*; *αἰέν* indeed is said for *κατὰ αἰέν*, *through breathing*, or *flowing*, time, &c. [*per tempus spirans, effluens, &c.*]

In regard to *ἄω*, the primitive word, I select the following, under *Ἀύζω*.

‘It arises, without doubt, from *ἄω*. For, by the rules mentioned, it is plain, that it is not *primitive*. The verb *αὔω*, therefore, arises proximately from *ἄω*; and thence *αύζω*. But *ἄω* is *to breathe*; and, as we shall hereafter see, appears to have been employed, *properly*, with respect to a *gentle breathing* [*leni spiritu*] of the mouth, or *halitus*, nearly such as is given forth in pronouncing the letter *a*.’

‘*Αἰω* is from the more simple *ἄω*, as we have seen above, in *αύζω*, and *ἄζω*. Our *αἰω* properly indeed follows the meaning of the verb *ἄω*, and signifies *to blow*, *to breathe* [*flare, spirare*]; whence, sometimes by the poets, it has been used for *to breathe out*, or *expire*, [*efflare*]. Further, from the *breath* [*spiritu*] of the mouth, it is transferred to the *animal life*, and so, to the *senses* of the animal body, and is the same as *to perceive*, [*sentio*]. From the body, again, according to common custom, having been transferred to the mind, it answers to *intelligere* [*to understand*] of the Latins. — *Αἰω* is used by Homer for *to hear* and *to understand*. The proper force is *to perceive*, [*sentio*]. The word is written *αἰω* with a resolution of the diphthong, also *αἶω*, whence *αἶσω*, *αἶσθω*, *αἶσθος*, *αἶσθη*, and *αἰσθᾶω*, *αἰσθάνω*, *αἰσθάνομαι*, *to perceive* [*sentio*]; and thus all the *senses* of man are called *αἰσθήσεις*. This is the reason why *αἰω*, is used not only concerning the *bodily senses*, hearing, sight, &c., but also concerning the *intellect*.’

‘*Αἰών*, *ævum*, *æternitas*,’ [*age, eternity*]. ‘It is a noun of that kind, which, in its own nature, denotes *collection*, and *multitude* of things, as appears from the termination *ων*.’ — ‘But, as we have seen in the word *αἰεῖ*, that it has been with great propriety transferred to the signification of *time*, from that of *blowing* or *breathing*, which is in the original *ἄω*; so in our *αἰών*, the same mode of transfer takes place; so that it may signify a sort of *collection* or *multitude of times*. From which proper signification again have been produced those by which the ancients have described either *age* [*ævum*], or *eternity* [*æternitatem*], or *the age of man* [*hominis ætatem*].’ — ‘From our Greek *αἰών*, the Æolic digamma being interposed, *αἰῶν* is produced, and hence the Latin *Ævum*.’

In regard to the force and effect of the termination *ων*, Lennep lays down the following general rule under *ἀγκών*.

‘Nouns ending in *ων*, formed from other nouns, are *collective*, or they denote an abundance of those things which are designated

by the primitive, as are *δένδρον*, a *grove*, from *δένδρον*; *ἐλαιών*, an olive yard, from *ἐλαιον*, &c.

I believe it will be acknowledged that the etymology of *αἰών* and its cognates is correctly traced by this writer, as above represented. I have made the extracts so much at large, because it was desirable to exhibit, as near as might be, in one view, this whole family of words.

Now on the supposition that *αἰών*, according to the common opinion, is compounded of *αἰ* and *ων*, then, if applied to *time*, it would signify a multitude of *periods* or *times* united to each other; * *duration* indefinitely continued. Its proper force, in reference to *duration*, seems to be more that of *uninterrupted* duration than otherwise; a term of which the duration is *continuous* so long as it lasts, but which may be completed and finished; as *age*, *dispensation*, *seculum*, in a general sense. If applied to *breath*, it would signify a *multitude of breathings*, or *breathing indefinitely extended*; and, if applied to simple *existence*, it would signify *existence indefinitely extended*. Some instances of its employment with respect to these subjects will be produced hereafter.

But it is not necessary to form *αἰών* by a composition of *αἰ* and *ων*. It may arise much more naturally and more in the common order of things, from the verb *αἰώω*. It need only be its present active participle converted into a substantive, according to the common usage of the Greek language. In this case it would signify primitively, a *breathing existence*; and by the uniform sympathies of language must, almost necessarily in process of time, be used to represent the *living soul*, whose presence in the body is made known more by the continuous breath of the mouth, than by any other means, and thence onward to any thing relating to the soul, *spiritual things*. 'From the breath of the mouth again, according to common custom, being transferred to the soul,' it would correspond to the *intelligens* of the Latins, and signify an *intelligent being*, or rather a *percipient existence*; that is, a *spirit*. As *αἰώω* signifies *to perceive*; so *αἰών*, if its participle, must signify *perceiving* [sentiens]. I perceive, indeed, that Professor Stuart has denominated this from *αἰώω*, 'a mistaken derivation of the word'; and while I exhibit it as that which is probable, I will not 'institute a strife' to maintain it. He

* 'The comprehension of many times or periods.' — Phavorinus.

will not deny it to be the *possible* derivation. Inquirers can judge for themselves whether it be the real one or not. In either case the original root is the verb *ἄω*, which signifies *to breathe*.

But, in every human language, some word originally representing *breath* has always been subsequently employed to represent the *principle of life*, the *living spirit*, and the *soul*. The transition is so immediate, one may say, so unavoidable, from 'the breath of life in the nostrils,' to the invisible spiritual existent within, that there is no language, in which terms originally relating to the breath have not also been employed to represent the *spirit*, and things relating to the spirit. In the Greek language there is scarcely a word employed in this signification, which may not ultimately be traced to a root associated with the breath. Even *ψυχή* itself, one of the most common names of the *principle of life* and the *soul*, derives its whole etymological right to a spiritual meaning from the same source. It is derived from *ψίζω*, *to breathe*; and thence the transition is made to the living existent within the material body; an existent, however, which may forsake the house of its 'earthly tabernacle,' and take possession of a new place of abode, a new sphere and mode of action, new means of perception, and instruments of operation, and still be its continuous self; 'having a consciousness of its own identity through an entire existence, [τὸν ἅπαντα αἰῶνα.]'

Let *αἰών*, therefore, be derived proximately from *ἄω*; or be it formed by the composition of *ἀεὶ* and *ων*, still in either case its ultimate origin is *ἄω*, *to breathe*; and it is the very word which the ordinary and necessary customs of language would assign to represent the living and invisibly breathing *spirit*. A sense of spirituality breathes in the word itself. A more appropriate word could scarcely have been chosen to represent the *secret, spiritual* existent, which mysteriously inhabits and actuates the material fabric of the body of flesh. Like the Hebrew *רוּחַ* it would express both the breath of the mouth and the *secret* existence within, which is continually inhaling and exhaling the vital air. Trace the descent of *αἰών* through whichever channel you will, its etymology is direct, and assigns it a *spiritual* meaning, as clearly as does that of the common terms in Greek, sustaining the same signification. It is universally granted, that *πνεῦμα* is employed in Greek to signify *spirit*, because it is derived from *πνέμαι*,

and ultimately from *πνέω*, to breathe. A correspondent derivation assigned a correspondent sense to *ψυχή*. But etymology does not more decisively assign a spiritual meaning to either of these words than it does to *αἰών*. The latter has from etymology as good a right to this meaning as either of the former. From the frequent employment also, of so many of the cognates of *αἰών* in senses relating to the *mind*, *perception*, and similar things, it would seem that its claim to a spiritual meaning was earlier than that of *πνεῦμα* and superior to it. In truth, although this be not the precise place for stating it, yet the fact is, that *αἰών* occurs in the extant classical Greek in the senses of *the vital principle*, *the breath*, *the spirit*, some centuries before *πνεῦμα* occurs in them at all. The evidence of this will be produced in due time.

Thus far concerning the etymology of *αἰών*. Etymology, I am aware, is not conclusive evidence of the meaning of words. It affords valuable hints of what the import of particular terms may be expected to be. It helps to unfold the ancient sense of words in the ancient literature of an ancient language, and bears an important part in the balance of probabilities respecting the meaning of words. But after all, it does not afford that positive evidence which would justify us in affirming with certainty this or that to have been the indisputable meaning of any particular term. Words change their meaning; oftentimes so much in the course of a few generations, that the etymological sense of a term may have been the true one among writers of one age, while among those a century or two later it may sustain a very different import. After etymology has borne its witness, we must next appeal to those other evidences in the case, which are more important and more decisive than this. But as etymology naturally comes first in order, I have therefore presented this as my *first* authority for a spiritual meaning of *αἰών* in ancient Greek. Its etymology leads directly and almost necessarily to such a sense. It remains that we ascertain whether lexicography and usage support this meaning. If these concur in their testimony with that of etymology, we have then the best evidence to the meaning of a word, and evidence which is all-sufficient.

My **SECOND** evidence of a sense of spirituality in *αἰών* is **LEXICOGRAPHY**. I willingly admit that the most modern classical lexicographers, so far as I have consulted them, do not

directly assign the meaning *spirit* to αἰών. But every modern lexicon, which I have consulted, does assign, as one of its meanings, *vita*, *life*, as a meaning distinct from *tempus vitæ*, *time of life*. It will not be disputed, I trust, that the English word *life* corresponds precisely to the Latin *vita*. Whatever meanings, therefore, belong to the term *life* in our own language, the same belong to αἰών in the Greek; according to the unanimous testimony of modern lexicographers. Such at least is the testimony of all who have fallen within my reach, whether classical or biblical. Now, I submit it to any man of plain common sense, be he unlearned or a scholar, whether there is no sense of *spirituality* in the English word *life*. Just so much as there is, there is by all witnesses so much of the same in the Greek αἰών. We often make use of the term *life*, indeed, in the sense of the *time of life*, or *period of the duration* of human existence. But this is not its original meaning, nor even its *most* common one. It as frequently, or more so, signifies the *state* or *condition* of human existence, without reference to a longer or shorter duration; the particular *state* in which any one is during the whole or part of his human existence; the *vital principle* or *inexisting power* which maintains the motions of life, (a very near approach to the soul, if it be not the soul itself.) We apply the same term, *life*, to the existence of disembodied beings. We speak of the *life of spirits*, whether good or evil, and even the *life* of the Divine Being himself; and we do not mean *term of duration* by it, but *state* or *condition*, *mode* or *habit of thought*, *feeling*, or *action*, or the *indwelling principle of existence*. And we never hesitate to employ the same word *life*, when we speak of the *condition of mind*, the *spiritual* state and habit of any individual. We call it his *life*. This illustration might be pursued to a much greater extent. But what is said is sufficient to show, that when lexicographers assign *vita*, *life*, as one of the meanings of αἰών, they assign it, among others, a sense of *spirituality*. It is almost surprising that this should have escaped the notice of Professor Stuart; for I cannot imagine him guilty of the meanness of asserting, that no classic lexicon within his knowledge gives the meaning of *spirituality* to αἰών, because they do not define it by that very word, if he were at the same time conscious that they define it by another word sustaining so much of that sense as the word *life*.

He must have hastily overlooked it ; and has thereby made it necessary to produce this evidence.

But notwithstanding the most modern lexicographers testify to no further sense of spirituality in *αἰών*, than what is contained in the term *life* ; the more ancient ones bear witness to it more extensively.

Hesychius, a lexicographer of either the fourth or sixth century, is the oldest to which I have had access. His definition of *αἰών* is very short, and makes no allusion whatever to any sense of *eternity* in this word. I extract from it the following, as all that relates to the present inquiry ; —

Αἰών, ὁ βίος τῶν ἀνθρώπων, ὁ τῆς ζωῆς χρόνος. Εὐριπίδης δὲ Φιλοκτήτῃ, Αἰῶνα τὴν ψυχὴν λέγει.

ἀπέπνευσεν αἰῶνα.

‘ *Αἰών, the life of man, the time of life. Euripides, in Philoctetes, calls αἰών the soul, “ he breathed out the soul” [or the spirit] ;*’ or in simple English, ‘ he gave up the ghost.’

From Hesychius then it appears, that Euripides employed *αἰών*, on one occasion at least, in the same sense with *ψυχή*, *soul*. This must, therefore, have been one of the meanings of this word in the days of that poet. It of course contained as much of a spiritual sense as does the English word *soul* ; than which it would be difficult to find a word in our language sustaining more of such a meaning.

It ought also to be remembered, that notwithstanding Hesychius gives us only one instance from Euripides of the use of *αἰών* in the sense of the *soul*, yet we have remaining only a small proportion of the works of Euripides. We have an account of more than eighty of his tragedies, while there are extant only nineteen. Even the *Philoctetes*, from which Hesychius makes his quotation, is itself lost. A single witness is, in such a case, of *extensive* value ; for it affords a fair inference, that, if all the works of Euripides were accessible, other cases of a similar use of this word would appear. At any rate it proves the meaning in question to have existed in his age, and presents the instance in which it may be found in the words of one classic Greek writer ; although it appear only through the medium of a fragment preserved in a lexicon. It proves that Euripides understood *αἰών* to signify, among other things, the *soul*. And what is lexicography but testimony of the sense in which writers or speakers employ

words? The most trust-worthy is that which gives the most correct account of such actual *usage*; not that which assigns meanings to words in an arbitrary manner upon personal authority alone.

I next appeal to Phavorinus, a lexicographer of the sixteenth century; some centuries to be sure subsequent to Hesychius, but yet not so late as to be ranked among the *most* modern. His authority I trust will be admitted as good, for it is very frequently quoted by the later writers, as that in which they place confidence. He gives a description of the meanings of *αἰών* at great length. I make the following extracts from it as sufficient to exhibit his mind, so far as the present inquiry is concerned, observing that the second member of his definition is taken *verbatim* from the 'Etymologicon Magnum,' a work of the ninth or tenth century.

Αἰών, ὁ χρόνος, καὶ ἡ ζωὴ, καὶ ὁ βίος.
Λέγεται καὶ ἀντὶ τῆς ζωῆς. "Ὁμηρος, ἔπειτά με καὶ λείποι αἰών, ἤγουν
 ζωή. ἢ αἰών ζωή. Ἄλλως·

Αἰών, ἢ ζωὴ θηλυκῶς. "Ὁμηρος, *Αὐτὸς δὲ φίλης αἰῶνος ἀμερθεῖς.*
παρὰ τὸ αἶν τὸ πνέειν. καὶ ἄημα, τὸ πνεῦμα. καὶ ἔμ-
προυν δὲ τὸν ζῶντα φασμέν. αἰών, καὶ ὁ αἰδῖος καὶ αἰτελεύ-
τητος, ὡς τῷ Θεολόγῳ δοκεῖ.

'*Αἰών*, *Time*, also *Life*, also *Habit or Way of Life*. It is also said instead of *Life*. Homer, "afterwards let EXISTENCE [*αἰών*] forsake me," i. e. *Life*; or, *αἰών* is *Life*. Otherwise;

'*Αἰών* is *Life*, femininely. Homer, "thyself shalt be despoiled of dear EXISTENCE [*αἰῶνος*]" ; from *ἄω*, to breathe; and the SPIRIT is breath. and we, also, call the *inspiring* the *living*. *αἰών* is, also, the *eternal* and *endless*, as it seems to the Theologian.'

Here I strongly suspect is the true secret brought to light, of the origin of the sense of *eternity* in *αἰών*. The theologian first thought he perceived it, or else he placed it there. The theologian keeps it there now. And the theologian will probably retain it there longer than any one else. Hence it is, that those lexicographers who assign *eternity* as one of the meanings of *αἰών* uniformly appeal for proofs to either theological, Hebrew, or Rabbinical Greek, or some species of Greek subsequent to the age of the Seventy, if not subsequent to the age of the Apostles, so far as I can ascertain. I do not know of an instance in which any lexicographer has produced the usage of *ancient* classical Greek, in evidence

that *αἰών* means *eternity*. I do not believe he could find a case to this purpose there. This constant habit of the later lexicographers, together with the *ὡς τῷ Θεολόγῳ δοκεῖ* of Phavorinus, and those who lived six or seven centuries before him, clearly indicates the source at which we must seek the origin of the sense of *eternity* in this word. Ancient classical Greek rejects it altogether.

As to a spiritual meaning in *αἰών*, according to Phavorinus, in connexion with the more ancient work, whose definition he adopts, the expressions are about equal to a positive assertion, that *αἰών* is a synonyme of *ἄημα* [breath] and *πνεῦμα* [SPIRIT], if I have translated them correctly. There is an ambiguity in many of his expressions which renders it difficult always to translate them so as to avoid all liability to objection. The sentence to which I refer admits of being translated in the more positive form — ‘also *breath*, the *SPIRIT*.’ I have adopted the first mode of translation, because I think it most likely that such was the meaning of the author; and I have no disposition to catch at a *word* to be turned to a self-serving sense. From the general air and aspect of this description of *αἰών*, and from the mode in which these terms are employed, there cannot be a doubt that he was contemplating *πνεῦμα* [SPIRIT], as a fair word for expressing one of the meanings of *αἰών*. Particularly when we perceive that the main reason for assigning to *αἰών* the meaning, *life*, is that it refers back to *ἄω to breathe*, and that *ἄημα*, *breath*, is synonymous with *πνεῦμα*, *SPIRIT*.

Indeed, there is no small measure of *spirituality* in *ζωή* [*life*], as Phavorinus employs that word in his definition of *αἰών*, and as it is used by ancient Greek writers. He evidently means by it something different from *βίος*. I have translated it *life*, on account of the comprehensive character of this English word, and its correspondence to the Greek *ζωή* and the Latin *vita*; and I have taken one from among the many meanings of *βίος* by way of distinguishing the one word from the other. But *ζωή* [*life*] in ancient Greek, is a word of most extensive import. It signifies much more than the mere *principle of vitality*, spiritual as that principle is. Aristotle furnishes a striking description of the extensive import of *ζωή* [*life*], in the following powerful passage; —

* *Ἐνέργεια*, inward, self-comprehended *power* and *action*.

‘The energy* of mind indeed is *life* [*ζωή*]; and he [God] is this energy. And this energy in itself is his *life* [*ζωή*] most excellent and eternal. And we say, that God is a *living being* [*ζῶον*], eternal and most excellent. So that *life* [*ζωή*] and an *existence* continuous and eternal appertain to God; for this is God.’ — *Arist. Met.* lib. xiv. cap. 7.

In this description *ζωή* [*life*] means something more than mere *vitality*. It signifies *spirituality* in the most decisive manner, and most extensive sense; for it represents the uninterrupted *spiritual* state of action, power, peace, and joy, in the Divine Mind; the whole realm of thought, affection, and efficient volition, as it is in God.

It is not for mortal man to judge, how far the deep-thinking and far-reaching soul which composed the above description of *life*, was ‘from the kingdom of heaven.’ We know, indeed, that he had not gone in by the only door through which we can arrive at the ‘fulness of God.’ But I cannot help thinking, that he had approached so near, that he could have some discernment, although comparatively indistinct, and desired to have a more clear perception, of that very thing which is described unto us by the beloved Apostle, as ‘the eternal [spiritual] LIFE [*ζωή αἰώνιος*], which was with the Father, and is manifested unto us,’ *in the Son*. In truth, the words of the sage are no bad commentary on those of the Apostle. The latter tells us, that ‘the *life*,’ that is, the life of God, ‘was manifested that we might see it’; the former tells us, that ‘the *energy of mind is life*.’ It is no small evidence also, of the inspiration of the Apostles, that we find an humble, illiterate fisherman of Galilee, possessing, exhibiting, and imparting by divine grace, that which one of the brightest and wisest of human minds, in his deep speculations and far-extending feelings, acknowledged to be the MOST EXCELLENT and ETERNAL, and labored so hard to see clearly and obtain. Was there no allusion to any beyond the Hebrew race, in the mind of him who is ‘THE LIFE,’ when he said, ‘Many prophets and *righteous men* have desired to see those things which ye see, and have not seen them; and to hear those things which ye hear, and have not heard them’? Is it not also, with reference to this immense sense of spirituality in the term, that the attribute of LIFE is so often appli-

ed to the Divine Being in the Scriptures, and he is so often called the LIVING God? *

But according to Phavorinus, and his copied predecessors, *αἰὼν* is a synonyme of ζῶν [LIFE]; and by fair interpretation of their words it sustains a similar relation to πνεῦμα [*spirit*]. It therefore implies as much of *spirituality* as either of these; and there are no words in the English language which imply more of it.

It can hardly be, that the lexicons of Hesychius and Phavorinus have fallen within the range of Professor Stuart's consultation, or he would probably have saved me the trouble of producing them. As it is, there they are; and they testify as they may to a sense of *spirituality* in *αἰὼν*, in the more ancient Greek. I have had no opportunity to consult other lexicographers of former times, and indeed I see no absolute necessity of so doing. These are sufficient to prove the asserted meaning of this word, and that lexicographers of authority have so understood and affirmed it. Taking these evidences in connexion with the sense of *life*, which both ancient and modern critics almost universally declare to be in *αἰὼν*, a testimony of a spiritual meaning in that word is borne, which is not to be refuted by the mere silence of one or two of the most modern writers, even though they be Schneider and Passow; concerning whom I would speak with the respect due to names so highly honored by Professor Stuart, although I have no acquaintance with their works.

My THIRD evidence of a *spiritual* sense in *αἰὼν* is actual USAGE. This is in reality the only ultimate resort. An appeal to actual usage is the *experimentum crucis*, which must decide the question, after other authorities have been consulted to whatever extent; and it is now proposed to submit the meaning of *αἰὼν* in ancient Greek to this decisive trial.

If it be true, that this word in Greek writers earlier than the time of the Seventy, and till then in common use, or in writers of near their age, was employed to represent *spirit* or *spirituality*, it will follow that the Seventy would make use of it in a similar sense, whenever they judged the Hebrew to contain a similar meaning. Indeed, in whatever various meanings *αἰὼν* occurs in those more ancient Greek writings, we may confidently expect to find it occurring in similar meanings in the Greek Scriptures. If it be true, that *αἰὼν* was a

* See Harris's *Hermes*, Book II. Chap. 5.

word of complex significancy, and yet is uniformly employed to represent the Hebrew עולם in preference to any other Greek word of a more precise import; then we ought to believe that the Seventy perceived in עולם the same complexity of meaning, and for this cause made choice of αἰών for translating it; intending to leave this term in Hebrew-Greek to be understood by inquirers in any or either of the meanings which it sustained in true Greek, according to the circumstances in which עולם should appear, and the peculiar import which it should seem most evident the inspired writer intended in the particular instances to convey by it.

I am now making an appeal to the actual USAGE of αἰών in ancient Greek. It may be necessary to remind you, that by the word *ancient* in this connexion I mean the Greek existing in ages anterior to the days of the Seventy, or in their own times. It is not my purpose to confine the inquiry to the particular meaning of αἰών now in question. It would not be right or fair so to do. The only way in which we can make a fair investigation of any particular meaning in an ancient word is, to ascertain, so far as we can, its general habits and modes of usage in those ages, concerning which we are inquiring. We may then gather up our evidence for the particular sense in question, not from solitary and insulated passages, but as it rises and shows itself among the general habits of the word. As far, therefore, as my own examination has extended, it is my design to exhibit this word in the different connexions and circumstances in which it has appeared. Let its particular import in particular places be exhibited; its prevailing meaning will be seen in proportion to the extent of the examination; and if the *spiritual* sense for which I contend does not appear, I am quite content to give it up.

With these remarks I now affirm, that αἰών in ancient Greek was employed, in common with certain other words, to represent *existence* — *state of existence*, particularly *state of human existence* — *state*, or *condition*, or *order of things* simply — the *principle of vitality* or *life itself* — *vital energy* — *breath* — *spirit* — *soul*, most commonly without, although sometimes with reference to *date*, *period*, or *definite duration*. In some few instances it signifies a *period* or *term of time*, but they are very few; and in no case within the range of my examination does it positively signify *eternity*. The word, **EXISTENCE**, would express its meaning in more

instances than any other word, inasmuch as *existence* signifies that which may or may not be, is, or is not measured by time, or confined to period or place, and that which may be material or spiritual, as the case may be. For this reason, in the instances to be produced I shall translate *αἰών* by the word *existence* wherever it can be so done with propriety, testifying as I may what kind of *existence* I believe to be intended in any particular instance.

Some of the meanings of *αἰών*, above named, are incontestably *spiritual*. Indeed, some of them are 'spirit and life' itself. Most of those meanings imply a measure of spirituality, or so readily associate themselves with it, that they exhibit a kindred import; and occurring as they commonly do, with reference to *human* beings who partake of a *spiritual* nature, or with reference to higher intelligences who are altogether *spiritual*, they evince their affinity to the same spiritual family.

It now becomes requisite to prove the correctness of the above description of the meanings of *αἰών* in ancient Greek, by exhibiting evidences of its actual usage. I have produced such evidence as I have obtained from etymology and lexicography. Nothing now remains but for *ancient* Greek writers to speak for themselves. Before I can call them to do this with any effect, it will be necessary to name some particulars which one cannot be very desirous to publish. But the state of the present case makes it necessary; for it cannot be expected that my assertions will be believed, unless the authority be exhibited on which they are made, nor then, unless the authority be satisfactory.

I must, therefore say, that in searching for the meaning of this and some other words in ancient Greek, I have examined line by line the following works, intending and endeavouring to note every instance in which either *αἰών* or *αἰώνιος* occurred; — namely, Homer's *Iliad* and *Odyssey* — Hesiod — Æschylus — Pindar (except the Fragments) — Sophocles — Aristotle's *Metaphysics*, and his treatises *de Mundo*, *de Spiritu*, *de Moribus*, *de Cælo* — Euripides. These are not a very great proportion of ancient classics to be sure, and an extensive Greek reader may smile at the meagreness of my catalogue. But they are all to which, at my distance from any public library, I could have access. Nevertheless they are competent witnesses for the general habit, in their respective ages, of such words as they employ.

In such a research, I may have passed over some instances of the words in question; but if so, they must be very few. I however hold my testimony ready to be corrected by any one who has made or shall hereafter make a more accurate investigation. It being a desirable object to exhibit the true habit of αἰών in ancient Greek, it is my intention to produce every instance in which it occurs in the examined works, in such a light that its meaning may be seen.

With the reservation of the right of being corrected, as above, I may be allowed, on such authority as this personal examination may afford, to bear witness to such facts as fall within the purview of such an investigation; meaning that my testimony shall be only of that which I know, and my witness only of that which I have seen.

In order also to make the whole subject as accessible as possible to the reader unacquainted with the Greek language, I here remark, that in the following pages, passages translated from Greek writers will appear in *italic* letters, having the word corresponding to αἰών in small CAPITALS.

With these explanations I submit the following statements.

In Homer and Hesiod the word πνεῦμα, the most common name for *spirit* in Hebrew-Greek, according to the customary translations, does not occur at all, if my examination be correct. Πνεῦμα could hardly have existed as a word expressing *spirit* in the days of Homer or Hesiod, or they must have occasionally employed it, so often as they wished to name the spirit or soul. They in all cases make use of other words for expressing these ideas, and among them the former occasionally employs αἰών.

In the Iliad and Odyssey, αἰών occurs thirteen times only as a noun. There are some instances of αἰών, the participle, in the sense of *hearing*, *perceiving*, or *understanding*, in Homer and the other poets above named, which I pass by. I will now produce the instances from Homer in which it occurs as a noun, and you can judge for yourself whether my assertions concerning it are correct. I have endeavoured to arrange them according to the meaning which this word seems to bear in the individual cases. There is some difficulty in doing this; and the propriety of the arrangement may sometimes be doubted or denied. It is submitted to your candor.

In the five following instances αἰών signifies *human existence*, the *state of being alive among men*; but without ex-

pressing in itself the *date*, *period*, or *duration* of that state. It is *state* without reference to *time*.

Iliad xxii. 58. Priam endeavouring to persuade Hector to enter the city and avoid the encounter with Achilles, says, '*Thyself shall be deprived of pleasant EXISTENCE.*'

Αὐτὸς δὲ φίλης αἰῶνος ἀμετροθῆς.

Iliad xxiv. 725. Andromache lamenting over the dead body of Hector; — '*Husband, thou hast perished from EXISTENCE, young.*'

Ἄνερ, ἀπ' αἰῶνος νέος ὄλεο.

In these two instances *αἰών* signifies human *existence* considered as *state* or *condition*, without alluding to its *period*, *term*, or *duration* in any sense. Whenever the poet intends to describe the *duration* of the existence spoken of, he adds some appropriate term, as in the three following instances.

Iliad iv. 478. '*A brief enduring EXISTENCE.*'

Μικροθάδιος αἰών.

Iliad xvii. 302. The same.

Iliad ix. 415. '*My existence shall be for a long term.*'

Ἐπὶ δηρὸν δέ μοι αἰὼν

ἔσσειται.

All the sense of *duration* whether longer or shorter, which appears in the last three passages, is in the terms *μικροθάδιος* and *ἐπὶ δηρὸν* — *αἰὼν* expresses no more than the *state* or *existence* alone, which in these cases is *human life*.

In the following instances *αἰὼν* represents the *principle of vitality* or the *spirit* 'which maketh alive.'

Iliad v. 685. '*Son of Priam, suffer me not to lie a prey to the Greeks; but save me; and afterwards let EXISTENCE [the SPIRIT] forsake me in your city.*'

Ἐπειτά με καὶ λίποι αἰὼν

Ἐν πόλει ὑμετέρῃ."

Iliad xvi. 453. Juno advises Jupiter to suffer Sarpedon to die by the hand of Patroclus, but to have him conveyed to Lycia and honorably buried, — '*after life and SPIRIT may leave him.*'

Ἐπὶ δὲ τόγχε λίπη ψυχὴ τε καὶ αἰὼν.

or as it is sometimes said in English, '*soul and spirit*,' meaning much the same as '*soul*, even the *spirit*.' [— '*anima et vita*, ubi utrumque idem notat.' *Damm.*]

Iliad XIX. 27. Achilles, speaking of the dead Patroclus, says ; — ‘ *The SPIRIT has been forced away ; the body may entirely corrupt.*’

Ἐκ δ’ αἰὼν πέφαιται · κατὰ δὲ χρόα πάντα σαπὴν.

Odyssey v. 152. ‘ *His [Ulysses] sweet SPIRIT was exhausting [or distilling] itself through sorrowful desire of returning home.*’

Κατεΐβετο δὲ γλυκὺς αἰὼν

Νόστον ὀδυρομένην.

Ulysses was *homesick*. And, perhaps, no disease more effectually consumes the *vital energy*, or causes the *spirit* to *distil itself* in tears than this. If you doubt it, you need only read the article *Nostalgia*, in Rees’s Cyclopædia, and you will be satisfied. Perhaps the *Ἰωμεν εἰς Αθήνας* of the Grecian exiles might not be far from exhibiting a correct view of the mind laboring under this disease ; or you may see no small portion of the objects, the sight of which causes this spiritual disease in the ‘ *Ranz des Vaches* ’ of the Swiss. But if you would see it as described in Scripture, I refer you to Isaiah li. 14. ‘ *The captive exile hasteneth, that he may be loosed ; and that he should not die in the pit,*’ &c. Or Psalm cxxxvii. 1, &c. ‘ *By the rivers of Babylon there we sat down ; yea, we wept when we remembered Zion.*’

Odyssey v. 160. ‘ *Nor let your SPIRIT consume.*’

Μηδὲ τοι αἰὼν

Φθινέτω.

In the same connexion with the last instance.

Odyssey vii. 224. ‘ *Let EXISTENCE [the SPIRIT] forsake me, beholding my estate, servants, and lofty and ample house.*’

Ἰδόντα με καὶ λίποι αἰὼν

Κτήσιν ἐμὴν δμῶάς τε, καὶ ὑπερφύεις μέγα δῶμα.

In other words, ‘ *Let my soul depart in peace when my eyes shall have seen these desirable things.*’

Odyssey ix. 523. Ulysses to the Cyclops exclaims, — ‘ *I wish I could send you to the house of Pluto, having deprived you of life [or soul] and SPIRIT.*’

Ψυχῆς τε καὶ αἰῶνος

Εὖναι ποιήσας.

Odyssey xvii. 203. Penelope speaks, saying ; — ‘ *O that chaste Diana would grant me now a kind death, that I may no*

longer, grieving at heart, be consuming the SPIRIT, through intense desire of the comprehensive excellence of my beloved husband.'

Ὀδυρομένη κατὰ θυμὸν

Αἰῶνα φθινύθω.

In plain language, Penelope was *love-sick*; a state of disease which physicians affirm to be exceedingly exhausting to the *spirit* of the human being. This being the last passage in Homer, I here remark, in reference to the whole, that Dr. S. Clark asserts, that *αἰών* is never employed in Homer in the sense of *long time*. — *Note, in Odyssey, xviii. 202.*

I know of no other instance of *αἰών* in Homer's *Iliad* or *Odyssey*, and do not believe there is any. I assume these as all subject to correction. From these it appears, that the only meanings belonging to this word in these writings, are

1. *State of existence*; in all these cases, *human existence*.
2. The *vital principle*, or *vital energy*.
3. The *spirit*.

To one or the other of these meanings each of the above instances may be referred; and the circumstances in which the word occurs sufficiently indicate to which it belongs in each particular case. It cannot be doubted, that the meaning of *αἰών* in Homer's age was habitually of a *spiritual* cast, or that in many cases it signified the *spirit* or *living principle* itself.

I notice in Hesiod only two instances of *αἰών*.

Theog. 609.

Τῷ δὲ ἀπ' αἰῶνος κακὸν ἐσθλῷ ἀντιφέρειζει ἔμμεναι.

'To him [sc. the married man] during EXISTENCE, evil is continually striving to abide with good.'

Scut. Herc. 331, if this work be allowed to Hesiod.

Εὖτ' ἂν δὴ Κύκνον γλυκερῆς αἰῶνος ἀμέσσης.

'When thou mayest deprive *Cycnus* of sweet EXISTENCE.'

The meaning of *αἰών* in Hesiod, is so far *spiritual* as human existence, or perhaps simple *existence*, partakes of spirituality. This is certain; — mean what it may, *αἰών* in Homer and Hesiod never means *eternity*.

In Æschylus I notice nineteen instances of *αἰών*, as follow; Prometh. 860.

Γυνὴ γὰρ ἄνδρ' ἑκάστον αἰῶνος στερεῖ.

'For the wife will deprive each her own husband of EXIST-

ENCE [the vital principle].’ The allusion is to the sons of Ægyptus and the daughters of Danaus.

Sept. con. Theb. 219.

Μή ποτ’ ἐμὸν κατ’ αἰῶνα λίποι θεῶν
Ἄδε πανήγυρις.

‘Never, during my EXISTENCE, may this consociation of Gods depart.’

Ibid. 744. Αἰῶνα δ’ ἐς τρίτον μένει.

‘And it [the punishment of ancient sin] endureth to the third GENERATION.’

Ibid. 774. Πονλύβοτός τ’ αἰὼν βροτῶν.

‘And human EXISTENCE was prosperous.’

Persæ, 263.

Ἦ μακροβίος ὄδε
Γέ τις αἰὼν ἐφάνθη
Γεραιῶς, ἀκούειν
Τόδε πῆμ’ ἄελπτον.

‘Truly this EXISTENCE seems long to the old when hearing of this unexpected calamity!’

Suppl. 47.

Ἐπωνυμία δ’
Ἐπεκραίνετο μόρσιμος αἰὼν
Εὐλόγως.

‘By the surname the destined EXISTENCE was praiseworthy completed.’

Ibid. 570. Ζεὺς αἰῶνος κρέων ἀπαύσιον.

‘Jupiter, lord of ceaseless EXISTENCE.’

Ibid. 577. Δι’ αἰῶνος μακροῦ πάνολβον.

‘Entirely happy during a long EXISTENCE.’

Agam. 230. Παρ’ οὐδὲν αἰῶνα παρθένιον
Ἐθεντο φιλόμαχοι βραβῆς.

‘The battle-loving warriors counted as nothing her virgin EXISTENCE [life].’

Ibid. 249.

Εὐποτμον
Αἰῶνα φίλως ἐτίμα.

‘She [Iphigenia] mildly sacrificed her blessed EXISTENCE [soul].’

Ibid. 556.

Τίς δὲ πλὴν θεῶν
Ἀπαντ’ ἀπήμων τὸν δι’ αἰῶνος χρόνον;

‘Who, excepting the Gods is free from trouble during the whole term of EXISTENCE.’

Ibid. 716. Παμπρόσθη πολύθρηνον
Αἰών —

‘*An extremely miserable EXISTENCE [condition]*’ — Induced upon Troy by the marriage of Paris with Helen.

Ibid. 1150. Περιβάλοντο γάρ οἱ πιεροφορόν δέμας
Θεοὶ, γλυκύν τ’ αἰῶνα κλανυμάτων ἄτερ.

‘*The Gods have granted her [the nightingale] a light-winged body, and a pleasant EXISTENCE [possibly a cheerful SPIRIT] free from lamentations.*’

Choëph. 24. Δι’ αἰῶνος δ’ ἰνγμοῖσι βόσκεται κέαρ.

‘*My heart is fed with groans during EXISTENCE [incessantly].*’

Ibid. 348. Τέκνων τε κελεύθοις
Ἐπιστρεπτόν αἰῶνα κτίσας.

‘*Having perfected an EXISTENCE reflecting glory on his children’s steps.*’

Ibid. 440. Ἐπρασσε δ’ ἄπερ γιν, ὥδε θαπτει.
Μόρον θεῖναι μωμένα
Ἀφερτον αἰῶνι σῶ.

‘*When she [Clytemnestra] had treated him [Agamemnon] thus, she buried him here, studious to establish his fate in thy EXISTENCE [soul] as a thing intolerable.*’*

Ibid. 472. Ἀπ’ αὐτῶν
Αἰών’ ἀναιρεῖν.

‘*To take away EXISTENCE [LIFE] from these.*’

Eumen. 315. Ἀσινῆς δ’ αἰῶνα διοιχνεῖ.

‘*He [who hath pure hands] remains during EXISTENCE unharmed [by the Furies].*’

* ‘Entomb’d him here, studious to make his murder
A deed of horror, that through all thy life
Might shock thy soul.’ — *Potter.*

It may not be unpleasant, nor altogether useless, to compare the thought of Æschylus in this place, with that of Shakspeare in Hamlet’s address to his father’s spirit; —

‘Remember thee?
Ay, thou poor ghost, while memory holds a seat
In this distracted globe. Remember thee?
Yea, from the table of my memory,
I’ll wipe away all trivial fond records,
All saws of books, all forms, all pressures past,
That youth and observation copied there;

Ibid. 560.

Δι' αἰῶνος δὲ τὸν πρὶν ὄλβον
 Ἐρματι προσβαλὼν δίκας,
 Ὡλλετ' ἄκλανστος, αἰστος.

'Casting for LIFE his former happiness upon the rock of vengeance, he perished unwept, unknown.'

I notice also the following instance of *εὐαίων*.

Pers. 710. Βίωτον εὐαίωνα Πέρσας, ὡς θεὸς, διήγαγες.

'As a God, thou hast carried on a life, an EXISTENCE BENIGNANT to Persia.'

Also the following instance of *ἀνταίων*.

Choëph. 586.

Ἀνταίων βροτοῖς. 'MALIGNANT to mortals.'

I believe no one will suspect that Æschylus ever imagined a sense of *eternity* to belong to *αἰών*. How far he considered it to sustain a *spiritual* import the foregoing instances may show.

In Pindar's Odes, not including the Fragments, I notice thirteen instances of *αἰών*, as follow ;

Olymp. II. 18.

Αἰὼν τ' ἔφε-
 πε μόρσιμος, πλοῦτον
 Τε καὶ χάριν ἄγων
 Γησίαις ἐπ' ἀρεταῖς.

'The destined EXISTENCE received them, conferring wealth and favor on legitimate virtues. — Existence here most probably signifies *condition of life*. But it may have been intended for some *divine being*, who according to destiny took them up and blessed them with wealth and favor.

And thy commandment all alone shall live
 Within the book and volume of my brain,
 Unmixed with baser matter.'

The fate of the fathers is in both cases similar. It was a 'deed of horror,' which so deeply engrained itself into the thoughts and feelings of the respective sons, as to form a part of their *spiritual* existence ; and Shakspeare's 'book and volume of the brain' cannot be very different from the *αἰών* [*existence*] of Æschylus. Some of our readers may need to be informed, that Clytemnestra had murdered her husband, Agamemnon, and treated his body with great indignity. The words above quoted from Æschylus are spoken by Electra, the daughter of the murdered king, to her brother Orestes, when making him acquainted with the circumstances of their father's death, and the barbarous treatment of his body by their mother.

Ibid. 121.

Οἵτινες ἔχαι-
ρον εὐορκίαις,
Ἄδακρον νέμονται
Αἰῶνα.

‘*They who delight in faithfulness possess a tearless EXISTENCE.*’ — May it not be said, *an untroubled spirit?* — ‘*Thou hast loved righteousness, and hated iniquity; therefore God hath anointed thee with the oil of gladness.*’

Olymp. ix. 90.

Μὴ καθέλοι μιν αἰ-
ὼν, πότμον ἐφάψας,
Ὅρφανὸν γενεᾷς.

‘*Lest AGE, hastening to death, should destroy him, childless.*’
Αἰὼν here seems to signify *existence rapidly finishing itself.*

Pyth. III. 153.

Αἰὼν δ’ ἀσφαλῆς
Οὐκ ἔγενε’ οὐτ’ Αἰακίδα παρὰ Πηλεΐ,
Οὔτε παρ’ ἀντιθέῳ
Κάδμῳ.

‘*An EXISTENCE free from peril was not allowed to Peleus the son of Æacus, nor even to the divine Cadmus.*’

Pyth. iv. 331.

Μὴ τινα λειπόμενον
Τὸν ἀκίνδυνον παρὰ μητρὶ μένειν
Αἰῶνα πέσσοντ’ —

‘*Lest any one being left should remain with his mother trifling away a safe EXISTENCE.*’

Pyth. v. 8.

Κλυτᾶς
Αἰῶνος ἀκρᾶν βαθμίδων
Ἀπο.

‘*From the first steps of an illustrious EXISTENCE.*’

Pyth. viii. 139.

Λαμπρὸν φέγγος ἔπεστιν ἀνδρῶν
Καὶ μελιχρὸς αἰὼν.

‘*A shining light is present, and the EXISTENCE of men is delightful.*’ — Will you allow me to say, *the human SOUL is joyous?*

Nem. II. 11.

Ἐπερ . . . νιν εὐθύπομπος
 Αἰὼν ταῖς μεγάλαις δέδωκεν
 Κόσμον Ἀθάναις.

‘If a rightly guiding EXISTENCE [SPIRIT] has given him for an ornament to great Athens.’

Nem. III. 130.

Ἐλᾷ δὲ καὶ τέσ-
 σαρας ἀρετὰς ὁ μακρὸς αἰὼν.

‘A long EXISTENCE [old age] produces the four virtues.’

Nem. IX. 106.

Ἐκ πόνων δ’ οἱ σὺν νεότητι γέγονται
 Σύν τε δίκῃ, τελέθει
 Πρὸς γῆρας αἰὼν ἀμέγα.

‘From labors, which are borne in youth with honor, there arises for old age an EXISTENCE of day, [a happy state, like continual day; or if you will admit it, a SPIRIT in daylight.]’

Isthm. III. 29.

Αἰὼν δ’ κυλινδομέναις
 Ἀμέραις ἄλλ’ ἄλλοι’ ἐξ-
 ἄλλαζεν.

‘EXISTENCE by revolving days changes different things in different ways.’

Isthm. VII. 59.

Ἐκαλὸς ἔπειμι, γῆρας ἔς τε τὸν μόρσιμον
 Αἰῶνα.

‘I have quietly come to old age, and to the destined EXISTENCE [condition of being].’

Isthm. VIII. 27.

Δόλιος γὰρ αἰὼν
 Ἐπ’ ἀνδράσι κρέμαται,
 Ἐλίσσων βιότου πόρον.

‘For a deceitful EXISTENCE [possibly SPIRIT] overhangs mankind, urging on the course of life.’

In Sophocles I notice the following nine instances of αἰὼν .
 Electra, 1030.

Ἄσχει τοιαύτη νοῦν δι’ αἰῶνος μένειν.

‘Endeavour to remain the same in mind during EXISTENCE [as long as you live].’

Ibid. 1091.

Καὶ σὺ πάγκλαυτον αἰ-
ῶνα κοινὸν εἶλον.

‘And thou hast constantly chosen an EXISTENCE [state] entirely sorrowful.’

Ajax Flag. 657.

ὦ τλάμων πάτερ,
Οἶαν σε μένει πυθέσθαι
Παιδὸς δύσφορον ἄταν,
Ἄν οὐπω τίς ἔθρεψεν
Αἰὼν Δίακιδαν
Ἄτερθέ γε τοῦδε.

‘Unhappy father, what a sad calamity of your son are you about to learn; such as no EXISTENCE [no individual] ever endured in the family of Æacus, excepting this only.’

Antig. 589.

Εὐδαίμονες, οἷσι κακῶν
Ἀγευστος αἰὼν.

‘Happy are they whose EXISTENCE [human life] is free from evils.’

Œdip. Colon. 1812.

Ποῖ δῃ-
τ’ αὐθις ᾧδ’ ἔρημος, ἄπορος,
Αἰὼνα τλάμων ἔξω;

‘Where after this shall I, desolate and perplexed, sustain EXISTENCE [human life] in sorrow?’

Trachiniæ, 2.

Οὐκ ἂν αἰὼν’ ἐκμάθοι βροτῶν, πρὶν ἂν
Θάνοι τίς, οὐτ’ εἰ χρηστὸς, οὐτ’ εἰ τῷ κακός.

‘No one can be acquainted with the EXISTENCE of mortals [the human state of being], before he may have died; whether it be good, or whether it be evil to any one.’

Ibid. 34.

Τοιοῦτος αἰὼν εἰς δόμους τε καὶ δόμων
Αἰεὶ τὸν ἄνδρ’ ἔπεμπε λατρεύοντα τῷ.

‘Such an EXISTENCE [state or condition], at home and abroad, is always befalling the man who is a servant to any one.’

Philoctetes, 179.

ὦ δύστανά γέννη βροτῶν,
Οἷς μὴ μέτριος αἰὼν.

‘O the unhappy race of mortals, who have not an EXISTENCE [state] of mediocrity.’

Ibid. 1390.

ὦ στυγρὸς αἰὼν, τί μ' ἔτι δῆτ' ἔχεις ἄνω
 βλέποντα, κοῦκ ἀφῆκας εἰς ἄδου μολεῖν;

'*Ah, odious EXISTENCE [human life], why dost thou still retain me living here above, and dost not suffer me to depart to the grave?*'

I notice also the following five instances of μακραίων, which may have some influence in elucidating the sense of αἰών.

Œdip. Tyr. 526.

Οὔτοι βίον μοι τοῦ μακραίωνος πόθος.

'*I have no desire of LONG-ENDURING life.*'

Ibid. 1118.

Τίς σ' ἔτιχτε

τῶν μακραίωνων;

'*Which of the LONG-ENDURING ONES [immortals] begot you?*'

Ajax Flag. 195.

μακραίωνι, LONG-CONTINUING.

Antigone, 999.

μοῖραι μακραίωνες, LONG-LIVED FATES.

Œd. Colon. 149.

μακραίων, OLD. 148. δυσαίων, WRETCHED.

Also the following three instances of εὐαίων.

Trachiniæ, 81.

τὸν λοιπὸν ἤδη βίοντον εὐαίων' ἔχειν.

'*In future to have life a blessed EXISTENCE [state].*'

Philoctetes, 855.

ῥπν'

Εὐαίων, εὐαίων ἄναξ.

'*Oh sleep, . . . MOST BENIGNANT king!*'

But I have occupied as much space as can be consistently devoted to this inquiry, in one number of the Examiner. I therefore pause here, and wait for a future opportunity to proceed.

Yours, in good will,

E. S. G.

Sandwich, Feb. 7, 1831.

ART. V. — *The Works of the Rev. ROBERT HALL, A. M. Minister of Broadmead Chapel, Bristol, England. First complete Edition; with a Brief Memoir of the Author.* In two volumes. New York. G. & C. & H. Carvill. 1830. 8vo. pp. 439 and 491.

It is somewhat remarkable, when we consider the reputation of Robert Hall, and the readiness of the English public to welcome and purchase the works of their eminent men, that the first and only complete collection of his writings should have been made, and that only within a few months past, in this country. We greet them with pleasure, because we have been accustomed to welcome whatever bears the name of that eloquent man. Yet we are free to confess, that some of his late controversial works have impaired the respect, which we had felt happy in entertaining for his character. Nor are we sure, that these volumes will add any thing to the permanent fame of Mr. Hall. Nay, we are even disposed to doubt whether, had he been consulted, he would have given his sanction to the whole publication. The fact, that no such collection has been made in England, and that, in one instance at least, the author himself has interdicted the reprinting of an article which on its first appearance attracted much attention, warrants our suspicion, that he had satisfactory reasons for declining it.

In truth, upon a somewhat careful survey of these volumes, and some knowledge of the feelings of the author, we do not believe, he will congratulate himself on the zeal of his American editor. Except those pieces, which are already extensively known, and have conferred upon the name of Robert Hall its deathless renown, they seem to us to contain little, which his admirers or friends would be anxious to preserve. And we find ourselves continually returning with dissatisfaction from the fugitive ‘Polemics,’ religious and political, which form no inconsiderable part of this ‘complete edition,’ and which we verily think the writer himself designed should pass away with the occasion that produced them, — to his earlier and, in our view, far higher productions. When Mr. Hall discourses of ‘Infidelity,’ and sets forth its presumption, madness, or ruin; — when he speaks of war with its crimes and desolations, while he inculcates

upon fellow-subjects and soldiers the 'sentiments suited to an alarming crisis';—when he calls upon a 'nation in tears' to stand still and adore the mysterious providence of God in the sudden extinction of its loyal and most cherished hopes, as in his unrivalled discourse on the death of the Princess Charlotte; or when, in the tenderness of private affection, but in the strength also of a Christian's faith, he pours out his heart over the grave of his friend Ryland; or when in a solemn charge, he addresses lessons of evangelic wisdom to the younger Carey, about entering on a distant mission, and destined to be 'separate from his brethren'—we listen and we admire. What is much more, we are admonished, quickened, and instructed. There is a grandeur and elevation of conception, an understanding of the 'mind of Christ,' and an utterance of the true 'sayings of God,' that command not our assent only, but the best feelings of the soul. We are totally forgetful, or totally indifferent, by what name he is known, or to what party among Christians such a writer belongs. It is enough for us that he is of the truth, and of that truth which makes us free. We go to his pages again and again with fresh delight. But when this great man descends to the troubled field of controversy, and humbles himself to assail, not only what he supposes to be error, but good and upright and illustrious men who hold it, he seems to us no longer of the same nature. He breathes a tainted atmosphere. He betrays the bitterness and uncharitableness of common disputants. And we are forced, not so much in anger as in sorrow, to lament the degradation which controversy can make of the finest powers. We mourn, as did Goldsmith over the eloquent Burke, when that philosopher and scholar consented to mingle himself with the political wranglings of the day, that

'Born for the universe, he narrowed his mind,
And to party gave up what was meant for mankind.'

To the works, to which we have already alluded, we shall have occasion to recur in the course of this notice. Indeed, they cannot be overlooked in any just estimate we can form of their writer. They are his glory; and in comparison of them most of his other pieces are of far inferior value. It will, therefore, be easily seen, that there are two distinct views in which Mr. Hall is to be considered,—as a preacher

and as a controversialist. The contents of these volumes also may generally be classed under the heads of practical or exhortatory, including his public Speeches as well as Sermons, and polemical, in the form of Reviews or distinct treatises. Under these heads we shall consider them.

But such of our readers, as have not already learnt, may first be desirous of knowing, something of the history of this eminent man. This is supplied in part by the editor of the collection in a Memoir, chiefly compiled from some brief biographical sketches from foreign journals; which, though certainly wanting in the freshness of delineation that personal friendship, or nearness to the scenes of his labors, might have supplied, may furnish a sufficient account of one, whose genius and eloquence have given him a place with the most distinguished of his profession, and even with the master-spirits of his age.

Mr. Hall, as we learn from this Memoir, is the son of the Rev. Robert Hall, who was in his day an esteemed minister of the communion, known by the name of the Particular Baptists. His fine intellectual powers were early developed, so that, as his father related, he perfectly understood the reasonings in the argumentative pieces of Dr. Jonathan Edwards at the *age of nine years!* For the writings of this great metaphysician we have ourselves heard him declare his admiration. But this was mingled at the same time with expressions, in his accustomed energetic manner, of abhorrence at the theological system, which theologians of a later day have professed to build upon them. ‘I cannot believe,’ said he, ‘that that illustrious divine would have given the sanction of his great authority to so crude a mass of presumption and error.’

The education of Mr. Hall was in some respects superior to that usually received by young men preparing for the ministry, among dissenters of his denomination in England. He was first a pupil in the academy of Dr. Ryland of Northampton; whence he removed to Bristol, and was under the care of Dr. Caleb Evans, whose character for learning, piety, and liberality of sentiment has been held in high esteem. At seventeen, he was entered a student of King’s College, Aberdeen; where, besides the other benefits of that ancient seminary, he had the privilege of attending, through his whole course, the lectures of Dr. George Campbell, the learned

Professor of Theology and Principal of Marischal College, whose valuable translation of the Four Gospels with Notes has given him a place with the most accomplished biblical critics of his own, or indeed of any other age. Here, also, our author formed an intimate friendship with Mr. (now Sir James) Mackintosh, for whose promising genius and virtues he anticipated then, what advancing years have abundantly confirmed — the highest distinction. Their friendship seems to have been truly fraternal. The letter of Sir James to his friend after the recovery of the latter from a malady, by which he has been repeatedly visited, cannot be read without lively emotion. And even during the continuance of one of those periods of mental disorder, which Mr. Hall has shared with Browne and Cowper and many other chosen spirits, one of whose most melancholy effects is the forgetfulness of past friendships or the confounding of friends with enemies, he is known to have uttered in some very characteristic terms his profound veneration for the superior wisdom and sagacity of Sir James, 'the first great man in the world, once judge of Bombay, and my classmate at Aberdeen.'

As a *preacher*, Mr. Hall early obtained the reputation by which he has ever since been honored. At Bristol, where he was first settled as colleague with his patron, Dr. Evans, as well as assistant in his academy, and afterwards at Cambridge, where he succeeded the Rev. Robert Robinson, in the charge of the Baptist Society in that place, he was eagerly followed and admired. It was here that he preached his memorable sermon on 'Modern Infidelity,' which attracted towards him the attention of some of the students and learned members of the University. It was at this early period too, that he produced many others of his most celebrated compositions, among which was the 'Apology for the Freedom of the Press,' first published as a Tract, under the title of 'Christianity consistent with a Love of Freedom'; concerning which Dugald Stewart expressed an opinion, something similar to which is said to have been pronounced by Mr. Pitt of the discourse on Infidelity, which, if true, might, we think, have disarmed Mr. Hall of his virulence against that statesman — 'that it was the finest specimen of English composition then in existence.'

But the malady, with which he had once before been afflicted at the opening of his ministry, again put a stop to

his labors; and, we believe, for nearly seven years he was under the care of Dr. Arnold, an eminent physician in Leicester, and particularly successful in his treatment of the insane. During this period, while his fine genius was suffering a mournful eclipse, he still gave evidence that he was not ignorant of its power; and among his friends some remarkable expressions are remembered, betraying a consciousness of his abilities, singularly contrasted with the humility which is said to mark his usual deportment, and which we are sure he is incapable of violating, when in the full possession of his reason.

On the recovery of his health Mr. Hall consented to take the charge of a society in Leicester, where, as he himself expressed it in our own hearing, 'amidst his native hills, far from that level county of Cambridge, and in scenes endeared to him from his childhood, his soul recovered its freedom.' Here he exercised a faithful, able, and successful ministry for twenty years; making occasional visits to the metropolis, where his preaching was always desired, yet unattended, as we believe, in his usual efforts, with any remarkable excitement. We are led to infer, as must of necessity be true of almost every great public orator, that it is rather on extraordinary occasions, than in the ordinary course of his public labors, that Mr. Hall's distinguished gifts are put forth. He has too much dignity and spirituality of feeling, too much real love of souls, and just appreciation of the design of preaching, to covet the popularity which in London, perhaps, more than in any other place where the sound of the Gospel is heard, has attended some noted mountebanks of his profession. Though not insensible, probably fully alive to the worth of well-earned reputation, we believe, that were it offered him, he would cast beneath his feet, as utterly worthless, the incense which has been poured out in their day upon Collyer and Irvine, and others of like pulpit notoriety, who have appeared upon the stage, not so much we fear for the instruction of souls, as for the gratification of an unprofitable curiosity; and in the result, whatever may have been the sincerity of their own intentions, to let all men see, and the best men lament, that the choicest means of religion may be perverted to the most selfish or secular ends.

At Leicester, as we have understood, Mr. Hall was greatly beloved and respected, not only by the people of his own

charge and denomination, but by the inhabitants of the town in general, and especially by some of the most respectable members of the establishment. The pious and venerable Thomas Robinson, the vicar of St. Mary's in that place, to whose character he paid an affectionate tribute as to a faithful, exemplary, and devoted minister of the established church, was his intimate friend; and when Mr. Hall left Leicester for Bristol to succeed Dr. Ryland in the place where his earliest labors were bestowed, it was with great reluctance on his own part, amidst the deep regrets of his people and expressions of general respect from his brethren and acquaintance of all denominations. In Bristol, as we learn, he is still living; and there, agreeably to the latest accounts of him that have been published, is exerting his admirable gifts and influence in the office which, by his life as well as preaching, he so well magnifies and adorns.

In 1819, the degree of Doctor in Divinity was conferred on him by our University at Cambridge, as it was also, we learn, some years after, by his own college at Aberdeen. His declining to append this title to his name is adduced by his biographer as a 'striking instance of his humility.' It certainly may not be inconsistent with it; and might, with him as with some others, proceed from an unaffected modesty, or from an impression, that distinctions of this class are incompatible with the spirit and with the equality, that should be maintained among the ministers of the lowly Jesus. But in general it may be remarked, that peculiar notions or a fastidious rejection of honors that are usually and by good men coveted, is not in itself a token of humility; that it may, on the contrary, be only one of the diversified forms of vanity or of diseased ambition affecting singularity (which humility never does), and pretending to despise what others count honorable. Most probably in the present case it was judged, and we think very rightly, that the simple name of Robert Hall carried in itself a higher distinction than any academical honors could confer, or that might be distributed among a whole synod of Doctors in Divinity, or of King's Chaplains *in ordinary*.

Of the Polemical writings of Mr. Hall, that on 'Terms of Communion,' the first in the order of these volumes, is the most elaborate; and for the importance of the subject, as

well as for its influence on the members of his own denomination, will probably be regarded as the most valuable. The object of this treatise is to extend the narrow limits of Christian fellowship and charity, within which the Particular Baptists have confined themselves, and to admit to the participation of the Lord's Supper disciples of other names. To establish this, Mr. Hall in the first place takes a view of the arguments commonly urged by the Baptists in favor of strict communion, and more especially considers the plea, that the institution of Christian Baptism *has the priority in point of time* to that of the Lord's Supper. This favorite argument, which had before been assumed as undeniable, he with great ability refutes; and denying also another favorite assumption, the identity of John's baptism with that of our Lord, he shows that *baptism*, whatever it may be understood to imply, at whatever age, or in whatever mode to be administered, *is not an essential prerequisite to the Lord's Supper*.

We cannot be expected to enter into a particular consideration of a subject, which, however interesting it may be to such as choose to multiply unauthorized barriers around the Table of our common Lord, or to confine a fellowship which the Head of the Church has opened to all, has little practical bearing upon Christians of a freer communion. If Mr. Hall did not convince, he at least alarmed his more exclusive brethren; some of whom, in this country as well as in his own (and with the former we believe was the late Rev. Dr. Baldwin), undertook to reply to his arguments. We may here only remark, that the part he sustained in this discussion was altogether worthy of his liberal mind; and we believe, that the weight of his arguments, seconded by that of his character, has availed to diffuse among that respectable denomination more just and scriptural notions of Christian fellowship, and a general spirit of liberality, which have evidently been advancing among them since the date of this controversy; or perhaps we should rather say, for the last quarter of a century. We rejoice sincerely in this progress of Christian light and charity; and to perceive that the miserable exclusiveness, which would shut up Christian ordinances within the narrow limits of a sect, is yielding to a wiser and a nobler spirit.

Mr. Hall, as is well known, has long been a prominent writer in the 'Eclectic Review.' It was in that ably conducted journal, that some of his chief controversial pieces, which were collected not long since and published in this city, under the somewhat dubious title of 'Polemics,' &c., first appeared. We omit the mention of most of them, except to express the satisfaction with which we read the review of the admired 'Essays of John Foster,' in which ample justice is awarded, and that with the hand of a master, to this ingenious and instructive work; and must pass to the notice of another article of a very different character, and, we regret to say, totally unworthy of the author's name. We refer to his review of the 'Memoirs of the late Rev. Theophilus Lindsey,' by Mr. Belsham. In this article, Mr. Hall seems to have given unrestrained indulgence to a spirit, which, though occasionally betrayed in some of his political pieces, is here exhibited in undisguised and revolting features. The most contemptuous expressions are employed, which after all serve him but as an imperfect cover of a rancorous theological hate. The unassuming virtues of Mr. Lindsey, for whom even the warmest of his admirers, as far as we know, never pretended to claim the praise of genius, are insulted; and the sacrifices, to which he submitted in relinquishing his preferments, and the privations he afterwards endured in his conscientious adherence to his convictions, are dismissed with a cold-hearted distrust. The very first sentences in which, contrary to his better knowledge, Mr. Hall confounds Unitarianism with the strange and peculiar tenets of Socinus, and attempts to fasten a stigma upon its believers by reproaching them with a name they never acknowledged, is an example of that illiberal spirit, which, with all our respect for his talents, we must decidedly reprobate. Indeed, when Mr. Hall speaks of Mr. Lindsey or of Mr. Belsham, he seems totally to forget, or else he wantonly violates, the urbanity of the Christian and of the gentleman. He thus introduces this article.

'As the life of Mr. Lindsey is evidently adopted as a vehicle for the propagation of Socinian sentiments, we shall be excused for being more copious in our remarks upon it, than the biography of a man of such extreme mediocrity of talents could otherwise possibly justify. If a zealous attachment to any system of opinions can be supposed to be aided by its

association with personal reputation, we cannot wonder at finding Mr. Lindsey's fondness for Socinianism so ardent and so persevering, inasmuch as the annals of religion scarcely furnish an instance of a celebrity acquired so entirely by the adoption of a particular creed. Luther and Calvin would have risen to distinction, in all probability, if the Reformation had never been heard of; while the existence of such a man as Mr. Lindsey would not have been known beyond the precincts of his parish, had he not, under a peculiar combination of circumstances, embraced the tenets of Socinus.

'His reputation is altogether accidental and factitious. Though the leading events of his life, with one exception, are marked by no striking peculiarity, yet, by the help of a great deal of adventitious matter, Mr. Belsham has contrived to make it the ground work of a bulky, and not unentertaining volume; disfigured, however, throughout, by that languid and inelegant verbosity, which characterizes all his compositions. It must be confessed, Mr. Belsham has taken care in this work to exhibit himself as no ascetic, no religious enthusiast, but quite a man of the world; not by a lively delineation of its manners and foibles, still less by a developement of the principles by which mankind are actuated, but by such a profusion of compliments bestowed on men of rank and title, and so perfect a prostration before secular grandeur, as has never been paralleled, we suspect, in a Christian Divine. At the "pomp and circumstance" of human life, this philosopher appears awed, and planet-struck, and utterly incapable of exercising that small portion of discrimination with which nature has endowed him. Every nobleman or statesman he has occasion to introduce, is uniformly ushered in with a splendid retinue of gorgeous epithets, in which there are as little taste and variety as if they had been copied *verbatim* from the rolls at the Herald's office. Orators of preëminent powers, together with virtuous and enlightened noblemen, meet us at every turn, and we are not a little surprised at finding so much of the decoration and splendor of this mortal scene, in so close contact with the historical details of Unitarianism. We have long remarked the eagerness of Socinians to emblazon their system by associations with learning, rank, and fashion; but on no other occasion have we seen this humor carried so far, as in these Memoirs.' — Vol. i. pp. 411, 412.

The prominent events in the 'Life' are then recapitulated, and in general with tolerable fairness. But whenever Mr. Hall has occasion to refer to the faith Mr. Lindsey had embraced, or to Unitarianism in general, (and for this he

permits no opportunity to pass unimproved) he sets no bounds either to his misrepresentations or his contempt.

For example, having adverted to some statements of Mr. Belsham respecting the favorable progress of Unitarianism, he proceeds to observe ;

‘ It is worthy of remark, that these extravagant boasts of success are not accompanied with the slightest advertence to the moral or spiritual effects, which the Socinian doctrine produces on the character ; this is a consideration, which rarely, if ever, enters into the mind of its most zealous abettors, who appear to be perfectly satisfied if they can but accomplish a change of sentiment, however inefficacious to all practical purposes. Their converts are merely proselyted to an opinion, without pretending to be converted to God ; and if they are not as much injured by the change as the proselytes made by the Pharisees of old, it must be ascribed to causes totally distinct from the superior excellence of the tenets which they have embraced. They have been taught to discard the worship of Christ, and to abjure all dependence upon him as a Saviour — an admirable preparation, it must be confessed, for a devout and holy life. Let the abettors of those doctrines produce, if they can, a single instance of a person, who, in consequence of embracing them, was reclaimed from a vicious to a virtuous life, from a neglect of serious piety to an exemplary discharge of its obligations and duties ; and their success, to whatever extent it has been realized, would suggest an argument in their favor deserving some attention.’ — Vol. I. pp. 420, 421.

And again, in concluding his strictures on Mr. Lindsey’s publications ;

‘ But it is time to leave Mr. Lindsey to that oblivion which is the infallible destiny of him and of his works, and to proceed to make a few remarks on the narrative, and the miscellaneous strictures of his biographer. In the first place, we congratulate him on his abatement of that tone of arrogance which so strikingly characterized his former publications ; not that we ever expect him to exhibit himself in the light of an amiable or unassuming writer, which would be for the *Æthiopian* to change his skin ; but it is with pleasure we remark less insolence and dogmatism than he has displayed on other occasions. He writes like a person who is conscious he is supporting a sinking cause ; an air of despondency may be detected amidst his efforts to appear gay and cheerful. He knows perfectly

well that he is celebrating the obsequies, not the triumph, of Socinianism ; and from the little advantage it has derived from his former efforts, his vanity will not prevent him from suspecting that he is giving dust to dust, and ashes to ashes.' — Vol. I. pp. 422, 423.

We trust, that with his advancing years and better acquaintance with Unitarians, Mr. Hall has learned to soften somewhat his asperity towards them. And we are truly happy to perceive, from the communication of a recent writer and the affectionate testimony borne to his worth by individuals of that denomination in Bristol,* that he has of late years better exemplified towards them the Christian temper. For — 'si sic omnia' — had he always written thus, there is nothing within the scope even of his transcendent abilities ; nothing that with such weapons he could have accomplished for the most signal triumphs of a party, that could have rescued him from the dishonor of a virulence and uncharitableness, such as in these days we expect to find only with the meanest and most unworthy of sectarians.

It has not, however, been only to Unitarians, or on topics of religious controversy, that Mr. Hall has descended to reproachful or contemptuous expressions. As a politician and devoted friend of freedom, he enters fully into the feelings, common to minorities in all elective governments, but especially strong among dissenters in England. The disqualifications by which this numerous but suffering body were for so many years oppressed, and from which they are not yet wholly relieved, produced their full influence on his mind, and never failed to impart a good measure of acrimony to his pen. In a letter, which he addressed at a very early period of his career to the Rev. Charles Simeon of Cambridge, the author of the 'Skeletons,' and of somewhat doubtful notoriety among the most zealous of the evangelical party within the establishment, it is easy to see, whatever candor may suggest as to the provocation, that Mr. Hall must have thought he was doing well to be angry ; nay, that even in the tenderness of his youth, there was that within him, which could on fit occasion be turned to bitterness and gall. And we remember nothing in the Letters of Junius, which for severity of

* See an American traveller's account of the Rev. Robert Hall, in 'The Unitarian Advocate' for February, 1831.

sarcasm or political hate exceeds the attack on Bishop Horsley, in his preface to the original edition of 'The Apology for the Freedom of the Press.' We must not fail to add, in justice to Mr. Hall, that this passage, delineating the character of the Bishop, was omitted in the second edition; 'it appearing to the writer not quite consistent either with the spirit of Christianity, or with the reverence due to departed genius.' We therefore omit it here, though as a specimen of malignant power, provoked by lordly pride, and writhing under a sense of political injury, we are tempted to preserve it. But, for the severity with which he has treated the political character of Mr. Pitt, he 'is not disposed,' he adds (and this long after that illustrious senator had descended to his grave), 'to apologize.' We may therefore repeat it here. And it is thus, that Mr. Hall speaks of that great statesman and orator of England.

'The character of Pitt is written in sun-beams. A veteran in frauds while in the bloom of youth, betraying first, and then persecuting his earliest friends and connexions, falsifying every promise, and violating every political engagement, ever making the fairest professions a prelude to the darkest actions, punishing with the utmost rigor the publisher of the identical paper he himself had circulated, are traits in the conduct of Pitt, which entitle him to a fatal preëminence in guilt. The qualities of this man balance in an extraordinary manner, and sustain each other. The influence of his station, the extent of his enormities, invest him with a kind of splendor; and the contempt we feel for his meanness and duplicity is lost in the dread of his machinations and the abhorrence of his crimes. Too long has he insulted the patience of his countrymen; nor ought we, when we observe the indifference with which the iniquities of Pitt's administration are viewed, to reproach the Romans for tamely submitting to the tyranny of Caligula or Domitian.' — Vol. II. p. 420.

In some other of the political writings of our author, with which, however, it is not our purpose long to detain the reader, we find more to regret of the same character, in which the meekness of the Christian has very imperfectly controuled the rancor of the politician. And, as is common with zealous partisans, we occasionally detect an inconsistency with himself, which can be explained only by keeping in view the various objects he proposes. The names of

Drs. Price and Priestley, for example, are set in very opposite lights, according to the medium, through which they are to be viewed. When Mr. Hall speaks of them as theologians, or as Unitarians, he is certainly never guilty towards them of any undue respect. But as friends of freedom, enemies of oppression, helpers with himself in the great cause of religious liberty and parliamentary reform, no one can charge him with injustice either to their abilities or to their virtues. Accordingly, in replying to a review in the '*Christian Guardian*' of his '*Apology for the Freedom of the Press*,' in which a violent attack was made on his own character, after having adverted with fresh severity to Mr. Pitt, he thus proceeds ;

'Another head of accusation is, that I have censured the character of Bishop Horsley, whose character, the Reviewer tells us, is far removed beyond my attack, while I have eulogized Dr. Price and Dr. Priestley, Socinians. To this it is sufficient to reply, that Dr. Price was *not* a Socinian, but an Arian : he wrote professedly in confutation of Socinianism ; and though I disapprove of his religious principles, I feel no hesitation in affirming, in spite of the frantic and unprincipled abuse of Burke, that a more ardent and enlightened friend of his country never lived, than that venerable patriarch of freedom. Such were the sentiments of the worshipful Corporation of London, who in token of their esteem presented him with the freedom of the City in a golden box : such was the judgment of Mr. Pitt, who long professed himself his admirer, and condescended to seek his advice on questions of finance. Dr. Priestley, it is acknowledged, was a Socinian ; but it was not under that character that he was eulogized. It was as the friend of liberty, the victim of intolerance, and the author of some of the most brilliant philosophical discoveries of modern times, for which he was celebrated throughout Europe, and his name enrolled as a member of the most illustrious institutions ; so that my eulogy was but a mere feeble echo of the applause which resounded from every civilized portion of the globe.' — Vol. II. p. 485.

Again in the essay, entitled '*Christianity consistent with the Love of Freedom*,' of which the author himself, as we have said,—probably on account of its offensive personalities, forbid a republication, he thus generously repels the accusations of a high-churchman against Dr. Priestley ;

‘The reader can be at no loss to determine, whom the author intends by a *busy, active man in regenerating the civil constitutions of nations*. The occasion of the sermon, and complexion of its sentiments, concur in directing us to Dr. Priestley; a person whom the author seems to regard with a more than *odium theologicum*, with a rancor exceeding even the measure of his profession. The religious tenets of Dr. Priestley appear to me erroneous in the extreme, but I should be sorry to suffer any difference of sentiment to diminish my sensibility to virtue, or my admiration of genius. From him the poisoned arrow will fall pointless. His enlightened and active mind, his unwearied assiduity, the extent of his researches, the light he has poured into almost every department of science, will be the admiration of that period, when the greater part of those who have favored, or those who have opposed him, will be alike forgotten. Distinguished merit will ever rise superior to oppression, and will draw lustre from reproach. The vapors which gather round the rising sun, and follow it in its course, seldom fail at the close of it to form a magnificent theatre for its reception, and to invest with variegated tints, and with a softened effulgence the luminary which they cannot hide.’ — Vol. II. p. 399.

We are by no means surprised at the weight of political influence which a writer, like Mr. Hall, is said to exert. With his truly Roman love of freedom and indignant hatred of oppression; with his command too of the resources of language, and no reluctance withal to draw from his ample treasury, as occasion may invite, the terrors of his rebukes or of his biting sarcasm, — any administration under a free government, like that of England, would be eager to secure his powerful aid, and might reasonably fear his hostile pen. But when we consider the comparative obscurity of his situation and his devotion to his own calling, we think there must be some exaggeration in the estimate of the compiler of these Memoirs, when he says, ‘There is not, perhaps, a man now living of whom the English politicians stand so much in awe as of Robert Hall.’

But we quit with pleasure his works as a controversialist, whether of church or state, which we are willing to consider his ‘strange work,’ in most of which his abilities are displayed to much greater advantage than his temper, — that we may consider Mr. Hall in his appropriate and far more elevated character as a Christian minister and teacher. It

is on this peaceful, consecrated ground, that we rejoice to meet him. This is his chosen field, in which, to (borrow from the same spiritual treasury, whence he is accustomed himself to derive his choicest ornaments) he appears always a 'scribe well instructed,' a 'workman, indeed, that needeth not to be ashamed,' a 'wise master-builder,' who leaves us scarce any thing to blame, and almost every thing to admire in his noble genius, his unrivalled eloquence, his evangelic fervor, his sanctified and glowing zeal.

Did our limits permit a full account of Mr. Hall's pulpit compositions, we should, at once, invite our readers to examine with us some parts of his discourse on 'Modern Infidelity.' This, perhaps, on the whole, the most celebrated, was also among the earliest of his compositions; 'the beginnings of his strength,' as it assuredly shows 'the excellence of his power.' It was produced at a crisis of great interest to the peace and religion of Europe, when the influence of the French Revolution had come to be extensively felt, and men, in a blind pursuit of civil liberty, seemed willing to disengage themselves from all religious restraints. Mr. Hall met the emergency as became a preacher of righteousness; and with that weapon, which since the days of miraculous illumination, no man has wielded more skilfully, — even the sword of the spirit and the word of God, — he assailed 'Modern Infidelity,' in its strongest and most secret holds. His success placed him, at once, among the ablest advocates of religion, and the benefactors of his country. 'It procured him,' says his biographer, 'the esteem of many illustrious characters both in church and state.'

The sermon itself, as is stated by the writer in his preface, was not committed to paper till after it was delivered. It was, no doubt, elaborately meditated, and afterwards very carefully written; so that what the reader might lose in the impressive elocution of the preacher, or his bursts of extemporaneous eloquence, imparting 'a grace beyond the rules of art,' is probably fully made up in the accuracy and condensation of the reasoning. As the discourse is so well known, or may now be so easily obtained, we shall not occupy our pages with more than a single extract, in which the author speaks of the '*principle of vanity*,' as most conspicuously displayed amidst the successive struggles for power during the French Revolution, and as, in itself, a fruitful source, as well as a natural effect of infidelity.

We recommend the whole sermon to the careful study of old men or of young ones, at the present day, who from their *vanity*, impatience of salutary restraints, hope of building up themselves on ruins, or any other passion, are tempted to a form of unbelief yet more modern, but in no wise less corrupting, than that which in some of its insidious influences is here so faithfully exposed.

‘We shall suffer the most eventful season ever witnessed in the affairs of men to pass over our heads to very little purpose, if we fail to learn from it some awful lessons on the nature and progress of the passions. The true light in which the French revolution ought to be contemplated is that of a grand experiment on human nature. Among the various passions which that revolution has so strikingly displayed, none is more conspicuous than vanity; nor is it less difficult, without adverting to the national character of the people, to account for its extraordinary predominance. Political power, the most seducing object of ambition, never before circulated through so many hands; the prospect of possessing it was never before presented to so many minds. Multitudes, who, by their birth and education, and not unfrequently by their talents, seemed destined to perpetual obscurity, were by the alternate rise and fall of parties, elevated into distinction, and shared in the functions of government. The short-lived forms of power and office glided with such rapidity through successive ranks of degradation, from the court to the very dregs of the populace, that they seemed rather to solicit acceptance than to be a prize contended for. Yet, as it was impossible for all to possess authority, though none were willing to obey, a general impatience to break the ranks and rush into the foremost ground, maddened and infuriated the nation, and overwhelmed law, order, and civilization, with the violence of a torrent.’

‘Humility is the first fruit of religion. In the mouth of our Lord there is no maxim so frequent as the following: *Whosoever exalteth himself shall be abased, and he that humbleth himself shall be exalted.* Religion, and that alone, teaches *absolute* humility; by which I mean a sense of our *absolute* nothingness in the view of infinite greatness and excellence. That sense of inferiority, which results from the comparison of men with each other, is often an unwelcome sentiment forced upon the mind, which may rather embitter the temper than soften it; that which devotion impresses is soothing and delightful. The devout man loves to lie low at the footstool of his Creator, because it is then he attains the most lively perceptions of the

divine excellence, and the most tranquil confidence in the divine favor. In so august a presence he sees all distinctions lost, and all beings reduced to the same level. He looks at his superiors without envy, and his inferiors without contempt; and when from his elevation he descends to mix in society, the conviction of superiority, which must in many instances be felt, is a calm inference of the understanding, and no longer a busy, importunate passion of the heart.

'The wicked (says the Psalmist) through the pride of their countenance, will not seek after God; God is not in all their thoughts. When we consider the incredible vanity of the atheistical sect, together with the settled malignity and unrelenting rancor with which they pursue every vestige of religion, is it uncandid to suppose that its humbling tendency is one principal cause of their enmity; that they are eager to displace a Deity from the minds of men, that they may occupy the void; to crumble the throne of the Eternal into dust, that they may elevate themselves on its ruins; and that as their licentiousness is impatient of restraint, so their pride disdains a superior?' — Vol. II. pp. 28—30.

In the year 1803, when England had just entered upon its longest and most desolating war with France, and there were reasonable fears of an invasion of some part of the kingdom by the French ruler, Mr. Hall delivered a discourse at Bristol, in the chapel of his friend, the late excellent Mr. Lowell, on the day appointed for a general fast, and before a company of volunteers. This is the sermon, to which we have referred under the title of *'Sentiments proper to the Present Crisis.'* Our readers may readily conceive the effect with which the following sentences in the conclusion, addressed to an assembly of soldiers, might be attended. It furnishes, also, an example of the manner in which the preacher is accustomed to avail himself of the prophetic language of the Scriptures. We know not how it may seem to others, but to us all the splendors of the embattled field, with the *'confused noise of the warrior,'* and all the inspirations of martial pomp or melody, would have little power to awaken heroic courage in the soul, compared with sentiments like these.

'To form an adequate idea of the duties of this crisis, it will be necessary to raise your minds to a level with our station, to extend your views to a distant futurity, and to consequences the most certain, though most remote. By a series of criminal

enterprises, by the success of guilty ambition, the liberties of Europe have been gradually extinguished ; the subjugation of Holland, Switzerland, and the free towns of Germany, has completed that catastrophe ; and we are the only people in the eastern hemisphere, who are in possession of equal laws and a free constitution. Freedom, driven from every spot on the continent, has sought an asylum in a country which she always chose for her favorite abode ; but she is pursued even here, and threatened with destruction. The inundation of lawless power, after covering the whole earth, threatens to follow us here ; and we are most exactly, most critically placed in the only aperture where it can be successfully repelled ; in the Thermopylæ of the universe. As far as the interests of freedom are concerned, the most important by far of sublunary interests, you my countrymen, stand in the capacity of the federal representatives of the human race ; for in you it is to determine (under God) in what condition the latest posterity shall be born ; their fortunes are entrusted to your hand, and on your conduct, at this moment, depends the color and complexion of their destiny. If liberty, after being extinguished on the continent, is suffered to expire here, whence is it ever to emerge in the midst of that thick night that will invest it ? It remains, with you, then, to decide, whether that freedom, at whose voice the kingdoms of Europe awoke from the sleep of ages, to run a career of virtuous emulation in every thing great and good ; the freedom which dispelled the mists of superstition, and invited the nations to behold their God ; whose magic touch kindled the rays of genius, the enthusiasm of poetry, and the flame of eloquence ; the freedom which poured into our lap opulence and arts, and embellished life with innumerable institutions and improvements, till it became a theatre of wonders ; it is for you to decide whether this freedom shall yet survive, or be covered with a funeral pall, and wrapt in eternal gloom. It is not necessary to await your determination. In the solicitude you feel to approve yourselves worthy of such a trust, every thought of what is afflicting in warfare, every apprehension of danger must vanish, and you are impatient to mingle in the battle of the civilized world. Go, then, ye defenders of your country, accompanied with every auspicious omen ; advance with alacrity into the field, where God himself musters the hosts to war. Religion is too much interested in your success not to lend you her aid. She will shed over this enterprise her selectest influence. While you are engaged in the field, many will repair to the closet, many to the sanctuary ; the faithful of every name will employ that prayer which has power with God ; the feeble

hands which are unequal to any other weapon, will grasp the sword of the spirit ; and from myriads of humble and contrite hearts, the voice of intercession, supplication, and weeping, will mingle in its ascent to heaven with the shouts of battle and the shock of arms.'

'I cannot but imagine the virtuous heroes, legislators, and patriots of every age and country, are bending from elevated seats to witness this contest, as if they were incapable, till it be brought to a favorable issue, of enjoying their eternal repose. Enjoy that repose, illustrious immortals ! your mantle fell when you ascended ; and thousands, inflamed with your spirit, and impatient to tread in your steps, are ready to *swear by Him that sitteth upon the throne, and liveth for ever and ever*, they will protect freedom in her last asylum, and never desert that cause which you sustained by your labors, and cemented with your blood. And thou, sole Ruler among the children of men, to whom the shields of the earth belong, *gird on thy sword, thou Most Mighty* ; go forth with our hosts in the day of battle. Impart, in addition to their hereditary valor, that confidence of success which springs from thy presence ; pour into their hearts the spirit of departed heroes ; inspire them with thine own ; and, while led by thine hand, and fighting under thy banners, open thou their eyes to behold in every valley, and in every plain, what the prophet beheld by the same illumination, chariots of fire and horses of fire. *Then shall the strong man be as tow, and the maker of it as a spark, and they shall both burn together, and none shall quench them.*'—Vol. II. pp. 107—109.

But there is no one of these discourses, in which the peculiar power, the holy eloquence, of this remarkable preacher is more happily put forth than in his funeral sermon on 'the Death of the Princess Charlotte.' That event, so sudden, so affecting, — blasting in an hour, by a double infliction, the prospects, not of a family only, but of an empire, was indeed a fit occasion, if ever, to impress solemn instruction. It was truly 'a night to be remembered,' when death went up into the royal chambers, and regardless alike of conjugal or maternal love, and of a nation's prayers, extinguished at once all that could be combined in princely grandeur and beauty and power, the fulness of possession or the visions of hope ; 'leaving in their room the funeral pall and shroud, a palace in mourning, a people in tears, and the shadow of death settled over both like a cloud.' Well may we here exclaim with the preacher, 'O the unspeakable vanity of

human hopes ! The incurable blindness of man to futurity ! Ever doomed to grasp at shadows, to seize with avidity what turns to dust and ashes in his hand, to "sow to the wind and to reap the whirlwind." "

Mr. Hall regarded this event, as he was wont to regard the whole providence of God. Many other preachers improved the occasion ; and indeed the churches of all denominations from one end of the kingdom to the other, on the day appointed for the funeral, were crowded we are informed,* with listening and weeping hearers. But of the discourses, which were published, of which we have seen noticed more than twenty, by some of the most distinguished clergymen of the day, among whom was the learned Dr. Bloomfield, the present Bishop of London ; there was none, which was admired or remembered, as was this of Mr. Hall. And when we consider, as he himself modestly intimates, the comparative obscurity of his lot, as the minister of a dissenting chapel in a remote part of the kingdom, belonging to a denomination of Christians, who, however respectable for their numbers, piety, or zeal, have not till recently even coveted the distinctions of learning ; separated, too, by his early education and habits from all the associations of rank and grandeur ; we are only the more astonished at the truth and justness, as well as sublimity of his conceptions. From his pulpit of instruction he looks on the glory of princes *as it is* ; unaffected by the glare of earthly greatness, except as he sees it in its uncertainty ; fixing his own regards upon what is eternal ; feeling that amidst all the splendor and power of earthly monarchs, 'God alone is great' ; † while, as a subject and a fellow-mortal, he yields them their due place among the things that are temporal.

With what true philosophy, on the one side, with what instructive and subduing eloquence on the other, does he contemplate at once the distinctions of royalty and the utter obliteration of such distinctions, the equality of the mightiest and the meanest, when God brings them together to the grave ! It is thus Mr. Hall describes the extent of this calam-

* See an interesting volume of 'Memoirs of the Princess Charlotte, by a Barrister,' which is among the best of the many publications called forth by that event.

† Massillon's Sermon at the Funeral of Louis the Fourteenth.

ity, and the difference of the emotions excited by a domestic and a national grief.

‘The first particular which strikes the attention in this solemn visitation, is the rank of the illustrious personage, who appears to have been placed on the pinnacle of society for the express purpose of rendering her fall the more conspicuous, and of convincing as many as are susceptible of conviction, that “man at his best estate is altogether vanity.” The Deity himself adorned the victim with his own hands, accumulating upon her all the decorations and ornaments best adapted to render her the object of universal admiration. He permitted her to touch whatever this sublunary scene presents that is most attractive and alluring, but to grasp nothing; and after conducting her to an eminence whence she could survey all the glories of empire as her destined possession, closed her eyes in death.

‘That such an event should affect us in a manner very superior to similar calamities, which occur in private life, is agreeable to the order of nature, and the will of God; nor is the profound sensation it has produced to be considered as the symbol of courtly adulation. The catastrophe itself, it is true, apart from its peculiar circumstances, is not a rare occurrence. Mothers often expire in the ineffectual effort to give birth to their offspring; both are consigned to the same tomb, and the survivor, after witnessing the wreck of so many hopes and joys, is left to mourn alone, “refusing to be comforted, because they are not.” There is no sorrow which imagination can picture, no sign of anguish, which nature agonized and oppressed can exhibit, no accent of woe, but what is already familiar to the ear of fallen, afflicted humanity; and the roll which Ezekiel beheld, flying through the heavens, inscribed within and without, “with sorrow, lamentation, and woe,” enters, sooner or later, into every house, and discharges its contents in every bosom. But in the private departments of life, the distressing incidents which occur, are confined to a narrow circle. The hope of an individual is crushed; the happiness of a family is destroyed; but the social system is unimpaired, and its movements experience no impediment, and sustain no sensible injury. The arrow passes through the air, which soon closes upon it, and all is tranquil. But when the great lights and ornaments of the world, placed aloft to conduct its inferior movements, are extinguished, such an event resembles the apocalyptic vial poured into that element, which changes its whole temperature, and is the presage of fearful commotions, of thunders, lightnings, and tempests.’ — Vol. II. pp. 165, 166.

Having then adverted with equal beauty and truth to the disposition common among men, to associate with exalted birth the idea of superior felicity, and to contemplate it with a pleasure unalloyed (*because of the very impossibility of attaining it*) by the envy which naturally springs up among equals, or where competition is not hopeless; having observed in the same connexion, that we are formed to be peculiarly affected by the spectacle of prostrate majesty and fallen greatness, he thus returns to the illustrious theme of these instructions;

‘Is it now any subject of regret, think you, to this amiable Princess so suddenly removed, “that her sun went down while it was yet day,” or that, prematurely snatched from prospects the most brilliant and enchanting, she was compelled to close her eyes so soon on a world, of whose grandeur she formed so conspicuous a part? No. Other objects occupy her mind, other thoughts engage her attention, and will continue to engage it for ever. All things with her are changed; and viewed from that pure and ineffable light, for which, we humbly hope, religion prepared her, the lustre of a diadem is scarcely visible, majesty emits a feeble and sickly ray, and all ranks and conditions of men appear but so many troops of pilgrims in different garbs, toiling through the same vale of tears, distinguished only by different degrees of wretchedness.’

‘While we look at this event with the eyes of flesh, and survey it in the aspect it bears towards our national prospects, it appears a most singular and affecting catastrophe. But considered in itself, or more properly in its relation to a certain, though invisible futurity, its consequences are but commensurate to those which result from the removal of the meanest individual. He, whose death is as little regarded as the fall of a leaf in the forest, and he whose departure involves a nation in despair, are in this view of the subject (by far the most important one) upon a level. Before the presence of the great I AM, into which they both immediately enter, these distinctions vanish, and the true statement of the fact, on either supposition, is, that an immortal spirit has finished its earthly career; has passed the barriers of the invisible world, to appear before its Maker, in order to receive that sentence which will fix its irrevocable doom, “according to the deeds done in the body.” On either supposition an event has taken place, which has no parallel in the revolutions of time, the consequences of which have not room to expand themselves within a narrower sphere, than an endless duration. An event has occurred, the issues of

which must ever baffle and elude all finite comprehension, by concealing themselves in the depths of that abyss, of that eternity, which is the dwelling-place of Deity, where there is sufficient space for the destiny of each among the innumerable millions of the human race to develop itself, and, without interference or confusion, to sustain and carry forward its separate infinity of interest.' — Vol. II. pp. 173, 174.

Notwithstanding the elevated rank of this young princess, and the obvious disproportion between her condition, as the heiress of the most desirable kingdom of the world, and that of any individual among us, yet we are persuaded that the sentiments of this discourse will at once find their way to every reflecting mind. They may instruct and comfort those, even in the humblest walks of life, from whom it may please God, at any time, to 'take away the desire of their eyes,' or to remove of the cherished objects of their love. For it is the province, as it is also the glory of religion, to adapt its truths and its consolations to human beings of every variety of condition. And while the world addresses itself, in one way, to the great and prosperous, and in another to the humble or sorrowful, the Gospel of Christ, overlooking all temporal distinctions, offers itself to them alike, as the power of God to salvation, as the common solace of their griefs, and their common refuge of hope, through the grave, that awaits them all. There is perpetual need of such instruction. Within the circle of every human society scarcely a month can pass without some interesting, though certainly not so signal, evidence of the universal frailty. And there is no one, even in the most sequestered scenes, who under the disappointment of his domestic hopes, the rupture of the conjugal or the parental tie, may not be soothed and admonished by the reflexions, which were so solemnly uttered over the grave of the Princess Charlotte.

Had it pleased Providence, that she should live, she would already have ascended the throne of her fathers, and would at this moment be the queen of Great Britain. Whether her education and character, to say nothing of her German alliance, would have fitted her for the present times; whether, in the present eventful state of Europe, when nations are calling upon kings for their rights, and the firmest and the most ancient thrones are tottering, she would have had wisdom and moderation to meet the emergency; or whether the

natural impetuosity of her spirit, which, it is said, she early betrayed, conspiring with hereditary notions of kingly power, and doubtless encouraged by a ministry of her own creation, might not, in the result, have proved injurious to the welfare, and even the safety of England, are speculations into which we pretend not to enter. The uncertainty attending them may, at least, suggest reasons for adoring a perfect Providence, even in what, at the time, appear its most mysterious dispensations; and, as with regard to other events that affect only our most private relations, for rejoicing that the 'only wise God,' the King eternal, omnipotent, reigneth, and that if man will but wait the issue, 'what he knows not now, he shall know hereafter.'

We have dwelt on this discourse much longer than we intended; for both the occasion and the manner of improving it furnish fruitful subjects for reflexion. There are other works of Mr. Hall of a different class, particularly those in which he has exercised his powerful mind on the subjects of 'Foreign Missions,' 'Bible Societies,' the 'State of Slavery,' and the 'Prospects of Christianity,' which, as they open of themselves a very extensive field, may well deserve, as they are exhibited in these volumes, a distinct consideration. This, however, we reserve for a future number.

ART. VI. — 1. *A Letter to William E. Channing, D. D. on the subject of Religious Liberty.* By MOSES STUART, Professor of Sacred Literature in the Theological Seminary, Andover. Third Edition. Boston. Perkins & Marvin. 1830. 8vo. pp. 52.

2. *Two Letters to the Rev. Moses Stuart, on the subject of Religious Liberty.* By BERNARD WHITMAN. Boston. Gray & Bowen. 1830. 8vo. pp. 166.

WHEN we were told, on the first appearance of Professor Stuart's Letter to Dr. Channing, that his object was to represent the Orthodox in this country as the calm, meek, and unoffending victims of Unitarian intolerance and persecution, we could hardly believe that he was in earnest. We had been reading, a little while before, several paragraphs in the

leading orthodox publications, in which Unitarianism was treated as being, to borrow the dignified language of the writers, 'on its last legs.' We supposed, too, in the simplicity of our hearts, that there was a pretty general impression in the community, that the measures taken to suppress or check the reputed heresy, were, to say the least, sufficiently strong. There seemed to be something unaccountable and bewildering, therefore, something almost ludicrous, in the new turn which we were given to understand that the controversy was taking, and in the new charges which we were to prepare ourselves to meet.

Perhaps we are not sufficiently suspicious of human nature, or enough on our guard against the manœuvring of able and wary antagonists. However this may be, we must say, that a careful and dispassionate perusal of Professor Stuart's pamphlet has convinced us, that he is perfectly sincere and honest in the *belief*, that he and his friends have been wronged. His language is that of one who writes under a keen sense of real or imagined injury, heightened and exasperated, it is true, by disappointment and mortification at the obvious tendency of things in this Commonwealth. Any man, and especially any man of Professor Stuart's reputation and place in society, who comes before the public in this state of mind, should be heard, as we think, not only with candor, but with tenderness and generosity. His letter has not thrown much light, it must be confessed, on the great subject of religious freedom, either in the way of argument or illustration, and amounts to little more than a positive and earnest declaration, that on this subject in particular the Orthodox party have been most unjustly and cruelly calumniated, and especially by Dr. Channing. 'I DO KNOW,' says he, addressing Dr. Channing, 'that the accusations which you stand pledged to support ARE NOT TRUE. I AVER that they are not, before heaven and earth.'

We will presume, that when Professor Stuart says, 'I do know,' he merely means, 'I do believe'; for otherwise we should be under the disagreeable necessity of convicting him of something worse than speaking unadvisedly and rashly. He misconceives, at least he misrepresents, in some important respects, the purpose and tendency of Dr. Channing's controversial writings; he denies, that there is any ground for many of the charges, which he supposes them to contain

against the Orthodox ; and concludes with demanding, that the facts, which these charges imply, should be produced and made good, or that the charges themselves should be taken back. The facts here demanded, or rather a selection from them, are now before him in Mr. Whitman's Letters ; collected all must allow, with great industry and care, and expressed and authenticated with extraordinary calmness, method, and perspicuity. We hope, therefore, that Professor Stuart, and his friends, will have the ingenuousness to acknowledge, that his call, in this instance at least, has been fairly met ; with what success it will be neither for them, nor for us, but for the public to decide.

This controversy is not one of our own seeking, and if we were to consult our tastes and personal feelings only, we should enter upon it with extreme reluctance. We hope, however, to obviate in a great measure the general objections to which such discussions are liable, by confining ourselves, as far as is practicable, to public acts, or at least to acts of public men, which are known and can be proved by public documents. Mr. Whitman's Letters to Professor Stuart contain, besides these, many well authenticated facts of a more private nature, which will cause his pamphlet to be eagerly and extensively read ; but they do not bear so directly on the argument, and we shall, therefore, leave them out of view, for the most part, in the notice which we propose to give of the great question at issue. We regret that Professor Stuart did not see fit to give his thoughts more order and method, as in that case we could have examined his Letter paragraph by paragraph. As it is, however, we do not mean, that any important complaint, allegation, or menace shall pass without comment.

To begin, then, with the beginning. Professor Stuart sits down to write, as it seems to us, with singularly vague and ill defined conceptions of what constitutes religious liberty. In his Election Sermon he says ;

‘ I am well aware, that there is much ground here, which has been, and which may be, disputed. It has been often alleged, by those who defend an exclusive civil establishment in matters of religion, that it is inconsistent with the prosperity, and even with the safety of any State, that any other form of worship than the one established should be tolerated. They avow moreover the belief, that there is a right in the civil government to prescribe in regard to the subject of religion, similar

in its nature to the right which authorizes the same power to restrain theft, robbery, slander, or any other offences of a moral nature.

‘It must be acknowledged, that it is not easy to meet the simple theoretical principle of this argument, by reasoning which is conclusive. “If the civil power has a right to interfere at all with the moral conduct of citizens, and to regulate it so as to promote what it judges to be the greatest public good; then why may it not interfere with matters of religion, which most of all are concerned with the regulation of the public morals?”’ — pp. 11, 12.

Further on he says;

‘On similar grounds, men, who avow principles which render null all obligation by an oath, either an oath of office, or one for the purpose of legal testimony, ought to be subjected to the disability which this creates. All who deny the doctrine of future retribution for crimes committed in the present world, do plainly, in the eye of reason, incur a disability of such a nature. Persons of this class fall below the very heathen, in their religious sentiments; for most of the Pagans have always admitted, in some form or other, the doctrine of punishment in the world to come for crimes committed in the present life. There can be no possible sanction to the oath of a man, who rejects all future punishment; and it is palpably a mere mockery of all the forms of justice, and of all the rational principles of true liberty, to admit those to the privileges of an oath, who deny that God will judge the earth, and reward men hereafter according to their works.’ — pp. 15, 16.

Again he says, in his Letter to Dr. Channing;

‘We know of *no exception* to participation in *civil* and *social* rights, and *the right of worshipping in our own way*, or of even *not worshipping in any way*, under a government that is free in the sense that we would have it; and all this without any abridgment of the rights of citizens, without any civil disabilities.’ — p. 14.

He immediately adduces as exceptions to this rule, which he has just said admits of ‘no exception,’ the case of Universalists, as set forth in his Election Sermon, and that also of Atheists. Then follow the grounds on which, according to Professor Stuart, religious liberty is to be defended and maintained.

‘We are aware how much has been said, and may be said, in favor of the State having some established form of religion,

and some particular religious test of office. But we are fully persuaded, that the evils which result from such an arrangement very much outweigh all the good that can be derived from it. Religion, all true religion, is a *voluntary* offering on the part of man to his Creator. A forced creed is no creed. Belief, from its own nature and the very constitution of the human mind, must be free, spontaneous, induced by argument, not compelled by fear or by threats. All professed belief of this latter kind, is utterly unworthy of the name. It is an object of abhorrence to God, and of loathing to men. And whether an attempt is made to force it on our minds, by the terrors of an Inquisitorial tribunal, or by the milder penalties of additional taxation and loss of civil rights, it matters not with us. We will not say that both of these ways of enforcing it ought to receive equal disapprobation from us; but we do truly say, that both receive our unqualified disapprobation.

‘We are the more confirmed in our views of religious liberty as already explained, because we see very plainly, that the religious opinions which the civil power may sanction to-day, it may to-morrow proscribe. It has often done so. But believing as we do, that religion is a matter of immeasurably greater interest than every thing which pertains to the present world, we should be among the last men on earth to commit the disposal of our faith to the civil magistrate, who might one day exalt the Christian religion, and on another trample the cross beneath his feet. We set too high a value on this precious gift of heaven, ever voluntarily to commit the keeping of it to hands which may thus desecrate and abuse it.

‘I have only a word to add here, in order to prevent being misunderstood, respecting a *special* obligation which one may *voluntarily* contract, to a religious society who cherish a particular belief.

‘If we enter such a society, professing the same belief with them, and understand it as a condition of membership or good standing among them that we continue to cherish the same belief, then, in case we do change it, it is plainly lawful and proper that the society should withdraw from its connexion with us as a member. But all this is a thing merely of *voluntary* obligation. And in *no case whatever*, do we believe that civil disabilities or penalties should be connected with any excommunication by a Christian church.’ — pp. 14, 15.

Here certainly is a strange jumble of ‘exceptions’ and ‘no exceptions.’ The reader will observe, that Professor Stuart’s notions of religious liberty do not prevent him from holding that a portion of the community at least, should be

laid under civil disabilities, 'on the ground of religious opinion.' We are also startled at the concession, considered as coming from a Protestant and a Congregationalist, that the theoretical argument, which gives to the civil government 'a right' to restrain heresy, on the same principles on which it does robbery and theft, can scarcely be met 'by reasoning which is conclusive.' But we have been chiefly struck with the total insufficiency of the grounds of religious liberty, as stated by Professor Stuart, if he means to advocate it as an inalienable right. Coercion, he says, cannot effect its purposes in compelling belief, because 'a forced creed is no creed'; and therefore legislative interference must be *futile*. And again; the civil power may be in the hands of misbelievers, or if it is in the hands of the Orthodox to-day, it may be in the hands of misbelievers to-morrow; and, therefore, legislative interference, as a general and established rule, would be *unsafe*. For these reasons, and as it would seem, for these reasons only, Professor Stuart comes to the conclusion, that legislative interference in matters of faith and conscience would be futile and unsafe in the present state of society. He does not say, nor intimate, nor imply, if we understand him aright, that it would be *wrong in itself*.

To what, then, do his arguments and protestations as a friend and advocate of religious liberty amount? Simply to this. Without admitting the innocence of involuntary error, without making the proper and necessary distinction between opinion and action as an object of government and legislation, without disproving or attempting to disprove the abstract right of government to punish reputed heresies, he comes, forsooth, to the conclusion, that the actual exertion of this right would be futile and unsafe in the present state of society, except perhaps in regard to Universalists and Atheists. Futile and unsafe? Let Professor Stuart go with this argument to his Most Catholic Majesty the king of Spain, and say, 'A forced creed is no creed.' He would be told, and told truly, that though force cannot be made to act directly on opinion, it may be made to act indirectly; that men may be placed in circumstances, and by force too, which will essentially influence and restrain freedom of thought. Let him, then, advise Ferdinand to renounce the policy as unsafe, because the civil power, though in the hands of Catholics to-day, may pass into the hands of Protestants to-morrow.

The monarch would tell him, we suspect, that he, his confessors, and the Inquisition would see to that. The true and the only ground on which entire religious liberty can be defended and maintained is this, that mere opinion, sincere and honest opinion, is in no case whatsoever criminal, and in no case whatsoever, and for no reasons whatsoever, the object of government or law. This ground Professor Stuart has not taken, and we presume will not take; and therefore it is, that what he calls religious liberty, and thinks to defend from considerations of expediency and practicability, rather than as a sacred, inborn, and inalienable right, is not religious liberty, but at most, and at best, religious toleration.

Professor Stuart speaks of 'a *special* obligation, which one may *voluntarily* contract,' on entering a religious society in which a profession of the same belief is understood to be a condition of membership. Now the question is not, in this discussion, whether the obligation is contracted voluntarily, or involuntarily; or whether a man has a right to contract such an obligation; or whether in any circumstances it would be expedient to do so. The question is, whether having contracted such an obligation, and while under it, a man can still be said to be in the full enjoyment of entire religious liberty. Can a man, while a member of such a society, and as a member of such a society, hold and profess whatever opinions he is honestly convinced are true? Professor Stuart assumes, if we understand him aright, or if what he says in the passage referred to, is pertinent, or consistent with his general doctrine, that when a man gives up his liberty, or any part of it, *voluntarily*, he does not give it up at all. In other words, if a man sells himself into slavery voluntarily, there is something in the consideration that he has done it voluntarily, which prevents his slavery from being slavery. Here, we must repeat it, the question is not whether a man has a right to make himself a slave, or whether in any circumstances it can be expedient for him to do so; but whether being a slave, voluntarily or involuntarily, he is at the same time free.

Perhaps a member of such a society is accounted free, because he is free at any moment to leave the society, and having left it, he can hold and profess whatever opinions he pleases. That is to say, if a slave is free, at any moment, to assert his liberty and quit his present condition, he ceases to

be a slave, even though in point of fact he does not assert his liberty, and prefers to continue, and actually does continue, in bondage. The question here is not, whether the members of such a society are free to make themselves free, or whether they might not become free in other connexions, and under other obligations; but whether they are free now, in their present connexions and under their present obligations. Would you not, then, we may be asked, allow a man, if he sees fit, to relinquish any portion of his liberty, especially if it is 'a thing of merely *voluntary* obligation,' and may be retracted at pleasure? Is it not essential to perfect liberty, that a man should be at liberty to do what he will with his liberty? Granting all this, it has nothing to do with the present argument. Whenever Professor Stuart, or his friends, shall agitate the question, whether they have a right to suspend, relinquish, or renounce their own religious liberty, it will be time enough to inquire into the grounds of such a right. The question now at issue between us is, whether they can give up their religious liberty, or any part of it, in any way whatever, and still retain it. Can they have it, and not have it, at the same moment?

Absurd and self-contradictory as this may be made to appear in theory, some may still contend that, in practice, the influence of Professor Stuart's '*special* obligation,' considered as a restraint on liberty, amounts to nothing. A few people who happen to think alike on religious matters, agree to worship together so long as they continue to think alike, and no longer. Whenever any one of them sees fit to alter his mind, he does it, and incurs no penalty for so doing, but that to which he has voluntarily subjected himself—expulsion from the society. Civil disabilities or penalties are never resorted to in these cases, and are disclaimed and condemned alike by all parties. This, we are given to understand, is the practical operation of Professor Stuart's principle; the practical operation of Orthodox tests, and creeds, and church covenants in this community, as enforced by Exclusionists.

The facts, however, are so far from warranting such a representation, that we can hardly look on a man as serious who makes it, or who assumes it, or any thing like it, in his reasonings. When a man assents to the covenant on entering an Orthodox church, he is understood to do it for life; and if he afterwards sees fit to alter his mind, he is told that

he has broken his covenant vows. Excommunication does not take place on the ground that a man has altered his mind merely, but on the ground that he has ceased to be a Christian. Every means is put in requisition, therefore, that can be in a free country, to keep or reclaim him from an apostasy, which is regarded and treated as criminal. He is flattered and cajoled, or warned and intimidated, or wept over and prayed over, as the case may be. Should this fail to prevent him from being convinced, and avowing his conviction, that the Bible inculcates a different doctrine from the human creed, he is cut off as an unworthy member. He is thrust out from ordinances, to which, it would seem, that he has as good a title as any other conscientious believer. His moral and religious character suffers essentially in the estimation of those, perhaps, whom he most esteems. He meets with cold and averted looks, where he used to be received with open arms, and, it may be, among his own kindred, and in his own house. All this a man does suffer, and must suffer, for thinking, speaking, and acting independently, under the practical operation of the exclusive system; and will it be pretended, that all this is nothing?

Several documents and testimonies collected by Mr. Whitman will serve to illustrate and confirm these statements, though facts of the kind here given are so common and notorious, as to make it perhaps unnecessary.

‘Let me quote a few sentences, in proof of this assertion, from the covenant of one of your new churches. “Hereafter you can *never withdraw* from the watch and communion of *saints* without a *breach of covenant*. Let it be impressed on your minds, that you have come under *solemn obligations*, from which you can *never escape*. Wherever you go, these *vows* will be upon you. They will follow you to the bar of God; and in whatever world you may be fixed, *will abide upon you to eternity*. You have *unalterably committed* yourselves, and henceforth you *must* be the servants of God.”’ — p. 47.

‘In one instance, the minister assured a lady who had embraced Unitarianism, that her *crime* was much more alarming than any open immorality. In another place, a man, who still adhered to Orthodoxy, was publicly excommunicated, because he sent his children to a Unitarian Sunday-school, and would not pronounce the Unitarian doctrine to be as bad as Deism and Atheism. But as you may want evidence of this assertion, I will give you an extract from a letter lately received by a gentleman in this vicinity from a most respectable Unitarian minister in another State. The

letter was written without any knowledge of my undertaking, and is now used by me without his knowledge or permission.

“The Presbyterians are waging most bitter war against us; war to the very knife. There is no form of accusation or misrepresentation left untried; the same slandering of private character, and the same misrepresentations, of which you see something in Massachusetts. They are endeavouring to crush all freedom of thought and opinion. No longer than a week ago, a man, against whose moral and religious character not a single charge was brought, a man who is a presbyterian in his faith, was publicly excommunicated from the Presbyterian church; and these were the reasons, *viz.* That he had sent his children to a Unitarian Sunday-school, and on being questioned by the church sessions, had said, that he did not think the Unitarian belief was as bad as it had been represented; that is, as bad as Deism and Atheism. These were the reasons, as read from the pulpit, in full meeting for communion, for expelling a man from the Presbyterian church, The people are taught that it is wicked to hear a Unitarian preach, or read a Unitarian book. The Rev. Mr. ———, in a long and labored paragraph, puts on the same ground, permission granted by the presbytery for the people of their charge to hear Unitarian preaching, and permission granted by a father for his children to visit a brothel or gaming-table. He says, that those who are trained up in Unitarian sentiments, are trained up in the way to hell, to be damned. Every means that can prevent people from hearing, thinking, or knowing any thing of Unitarianism; every measure that can be devised and enforced, is put in operation. The terrors of church censure and hell-fire, things almost equally terrible, are made the instruments of barring men from thought and knowledge. Every thing like freedom of thought is crushed. This is what is to be feared; not Calvinistic doctrines, but this tyranny over men's opinions and consciences; a tyranny to the full as bad as any that could possibly proceed from the union of church and state; a tyranny that stretches across our land, blighting and withering, and making thousands and tens of thousands of unbelievers and hypocrites. *September, 1830.*” — pp. 48, 49.

“Three individuals of the first church in Newton removed some ten or fifteen years since into the town of Brighton. About a year ago, they requested a dismissal from that church, and a recommendation to the Congregational church in the place of their residence. In answer to their request, the following absolute refusal was received.

“*Rev. and Dear Sir,*

“Your letter requesting the dismissal and recommendation of three of our church members now residing in Brighton, has

been laid before this church. After mature deliberation, it was voted unanimously, 'that we do not comply with the request.' The reason for passing such a vote, was not because the three individuals were not in *good CHRISTIAN standing among us*; but the *sole* reason was, because we considered a compliance with your request '*manifestly unsafe*.' In thus voting, we have followed the directions given in the Cambridge Platform. That expressly declares, 'if a member's departure be manifestly *unsafe* and *SINFUL*, the church may not assent thereunto.'

'Now had this said church read the whole of the paragraph from which this quotation is taken; and more especially, had they read a note by the Orthodox editor of the new edition of the Platform at the bottom of another page, they would have been obliged to invent some other excuse for their refusal. The individuals concerned perused these remarks, and in strict compliance with the rules of the Platform, provided for their case, joined the first church in Brighton. Whereupon, a bull of excommunication was thundered forth from the pulpit of the first church in Newton.' — p. 50.

At Brookfield, also, some Orthodox members of the Second Church seceded, and having done so, saw fit, in the next place, to go through the form of excommunicating their brethren whom they had left. But they did not stop here.

'After the vote of excommunication had been sent to the regular church-members, a letter of warning and reproof was also forwarded to each of the excluded individuals. I will give a copy of the letter sent by this said body of seceders to ten females at a still later period.

' "To Mrs. ———

' "With unfeigned solicitude for your most precious interests, *the church* are constrained to request you very seriously to consider the feelings and conduct which have placed you in your present situation. With affectionate concern, we beg you in the calm hour of serious reflection, to ask conscience, whether from regard to the will and command of your Lord, or from *other* considerations, you have ceased to commune and worship with us in the profession of that faith, which in connecting yourself with this church, you publicly declared to be the ground of your hope in God. Is it a light matter to *break from a covenant so solemn* in its nature as that into which *you entered with the Lord and this church*; the obligations of which you voluntarily assumed, and before God and man you religiously promised to fulfill? Whatever *others* may pretend, do *you* feel, that with *safety*, you

may release yourself at pleasure from the *bonds* of such a covenant; and without *any formality* adopt another essentially differing in articles of faith and rules of practice? Is this, we would ask, walking orderly as a member of Christ's church? And have you no *anxiety* how such a transaction is regarded by your Lord and Master? Let us not deceive ourselves. The whole of these proceedings will be reviewed in the great day. And in the realizing prospect of that awful scene, can you feel, that with an approving mind you will be able to answer to your Lord and Judge? *We pretend not to exercise dominion over your faith; nor would we retain you in our connexion contrary to your own inclinations. If we cannot walk by the same rule, it is best to be separate.* Still we cannot but consider it *awfully dangerous* to trifle with *solemn vows*. And as one with whom we were associated in endearing bonds; with whom we took delight in going to the house of God, and to the table of our Lord; and whose departure has occasioned deep regret, we cannot but earnestly desire, that if you are in a *dangerous error*, as we honestly believe you to be, that you may be convinced of it, and *REPENT* ere it be too late. And as the *last* expression of our faithfulness and regard, we entreat of you seriously to pause and consider." — pp. 52, 53.

But these women were not burnt at the stake, nor immured in dungeons, nor branded on the forehead, nor punished with outlawry. 'In no case whatever,' says Professor Stuart, 'do we believe that civil disabilities or penalties should be connected with any excommunication by a Christian church.' The Catholics in this country and in England say precisely the same thing, and say it as solemnly, as unreservedly, and, we are bound to believe, as sincerely.*

* 'Mr. Fox's principles of civil and religious liberty are known to have been of the most enlarged kind. On one occasion he desired the writer of these pages to attend him, to confer with him, as he condescended to say, on Catholic emancipation. He asked the writer "what he thought the best ground on which it could be advocated?" The writer suggested it to be — "that it is both unjust and detrimental to the state to deprive any portion of its subjects of their civil rights, on account of their religious principles, if these are not inconsistent with moral or civil duty." "No, Sir;" Mr. Fox said, with great animation; "that is not the best ground. The best ground — and the only ground to be defended in all parts — is, that *action*, not *principle*, is the object of law and legislation. With a person's principles no government has a right to interfere." "Am I then to understand," said the writer, wishing to bring the matter at once to issue by supposing an extreme case, "that in 1713, when the houses of Brunswick and Stuart were equally balanced, if a person published a book in which he attempted to prove, that the house of Hanover unlawfully possessed the

Now we will allow the declaration to prove as much in favor of Professor Stuart and his friends, as they will allow it to prove in favor of the Catholics, and no more. Will Professor Stuart and his friends admit, that the Catholics in this country and in England, though they do not resort to the civil power, and disclaim its interposition in religious matters, are not subject to influences which act as a restraint on their religious liberty? Civil disabilities and penalties are among the means, it is true, but they are not the only, nor the most efficient means, by which freedom of thought may be discouraged and checked. They do not chain up the mind, nor seal the lips. We may still think as we please, and speak as we please, if we are willing to risk the consequences. But they connect a sense of danger with the honest and fearless investigation of truth, and with an honest and fearless avowal of our convictions. Any thing which has this effect, and because it has this effect, is justly accounted an infringement of religious liberty, no matter whether the danger in question respects our property, persons, or character, our social, our civil, or our religious standing and prospects. It is essential to religious liberty, that every doctrine should be regarded as open to discussion; that we should feel ourselves responsible for nothing in the discussion but for the fairness and diligence with which it is conducted; and that there should be no influence whatever to incline us to one conclusion, rather than to another, but the evidence before us.

The ablest and boldest assertors of freedom in other countries have aimed their attacks mainly, as was natural, against the most obvious and palpable of the abuses under which

British throne, and that all who obeyed the prince on it, were morally criminal, he ought not to be punished by law?" "Government," said Mr. Fox, "should answer the book, but should not set its officers upon its author. No," he said, with great energy, and rising from his seat, "the more I think of the subject, the more I am convinced of the truth of my position — *action*, not *principle*, is the true object of government." In his excellent speech for the repeal of the test, Mr. Fox adopted this principle in its fullest extent; and enforced and illustrated it with an admirable union of argument and eloquence.' — *Butler's Memoirs of the Catholics*, Vol. IV, pp. 184, 185.

We do not give Mr. Fox's principles as those of a Catholic, but because they are interesting generally as the sentiments of a profound statesman on this subject, and because they are connected with an expression of Mr. Butler's own views, the well known champion of catholicity.

they were suffering,—against oppressive laws and institutions. This has left the impression on many, that religious liberty has nothing to fear except from the magistracy and hierarchy, and nothing to fear, of course, from any quarter, where the magistracy will not interfere, and where no legally constituted hierarchy exists. The truth is, however, that even in those Catholic states, in which the whole power of the government is directly or indirectly in the hands of priests, these men find it much easier to blind and subdue the people by spiritual menaces and terrors, than by the secular arm. In France, at the Revolution, when the doors of the religious houses were thrown open, it was found to have no effect on an immense majority, especially of the nuns, to tell them that, so far as civil disabilities or penalties were concerned, they were emancipated from their vows. There is no way, in which the mind can be shackled and enslaved so effectually, and so hopelessly, as by its own prejudices, superstitions, and fears. No matter by what means, and no matter under what laws and institutions, if a whole people, or a whole party, or a single church, are made to attach a sense of danger or guilt to an honest and fearless investigation of any subject, or to an honest and fearless avowal of the convictions to which such an investigation may lead, on that particular subject they are not free. Who cannot perceive, that this state of things may be brought about in any country, not only by intolerant laws and institutions, but by an intolerant party, or an intolerant creed,—by a system of exclusion, denunciations, and menace in religion?

Now we find no evidence in Professor Stuart's writings, that he means any thing more by religious liberty, than an exemption from legislative interference on the part of the government. It is true, he condemns a resort to 'slander and abuse' as a means of propagating one's religious opinions; but he condemns it as an offence against law, not liberty. In the eye of the civil government, he maintains, with some important exceptions however, that all persons should stand, nominally at least, on the same footing, whatever may be their religious opinions or ceremonies, or even though they may have none. That is to say, he would not have a man's religious liberty taken away at the expense of his civil liberty. This doctrine might help us to preserve the latter, or at least a semblance of it; but it would not insure us a continuance of even a semblance of the former. We doubt, indeed,

whether Professor Stuart has any clear conception of what constitutes religious liberty, considered as distinct from civil liberty, and capable of a distinct and independent vindication. He does not appear to understand what Dr. Channing means by freedom of thought, founded not on our civil and social relations, nor yet on any notion of expediency or practicability, but on an inborn, sacred, and inalienable right of private judgment in matters of conscience. His mind, we suspect, is not made up on the previous question, respecting the existence of such a right, — a right which no man, or body of men, can lose, give up, or forfeit in any case whatever, and which no man, or body of men, can attempt to restrain or overawe in any way whatever, or under any pretence whatever, without being guilty of usurpation. Judging from this Letter, and from other writings of his which have come under our notice, his views on the whole subject are not only defective and wrong in many respects, but vague and ill defined throughout. Hence the difficulties in the way of the theoretical argument, which to his mind, he confesses, are insuperable; hence the total inadequacy of the grounds on which he rests that degree of practical liberty, which he would allow; and hence also his frequent self-contradictions.

We are confident, indeed, that Professor Stuart's notions of religious liberty fall far short of Dr. Channing's, and are extremely vague, or he would not consent for a moment to the conditions on which he holds his professorship. According to the statutes of the foundation, he pledged himself at his installation, and must renew this pledge every five years, that he will interpret the Scriptures, and inculcate the Christian faith, so as to make them conform to a creed framed, we suppose he will allow, by 'frail, fallible, prejudiced mortals.' He may say, perhaps, that he submits to these conditions voluntarily, and that he has a right to do so, if he sees fit. Waiving for the present all discussion of these points, the question still arises, whether such conditions must not operate as a restraint on his liberty, as a religious teacher. Can he open and explain the Scriptures to his pupils, as God shall give him light, and inculcate any doctrine which further investigation may convince him is there revealed? He cannot. Then he is not free. It is to no purpose to say, that his liberty is restrained on a few points only, which the creed specifies, and that on all others he can teach what he pleases.

This is admitting that he has given up his liberty, if not wholly, at least in part; nay, that he has given up his liberty wholly in regard to those doctrines and principles, respecting which it is most important, that his instructions should not be liable even to the suspicion of unworthy biases. But perhaps it may be urged, that he is not bound by the statutes of the foundation, because he is not bound to the place, and can resign it at any moment. That is to say, he is not bound by these statutes as a man, but he is bound by them, beyond all question, as a professor. He can resign his place, and be free, but he cannot retain it and be so. The most plausible ground on which Professor Stuart's submission to such conditions can be defended is, that he is convinced, that the Scriptures really teach the doctrines embodied in the creed, and that he shall never see cause to alter this conviction. In this state of mind he is like a valetudinarian or hypochondriac, who has come to the conclusion that he shall never leave his chamber under any circumstances, and therefore thinks that it can make no difference to him, if his chamber be a prison.

Mr. Whitman has stated, with his usual clearness and force, in what way the solemn pledges given by Professor Stuart must abridge his freedom and independence.

'Now which is made your standard of religious truth, *as a Professor*, this human creed, or the Bible? The creed, surely. For should you refuse to profess your belief in all its statements, you could not be inducted into the office of Professor. And should you refuse to renew your assent every five years, you must be dismissed from the Seminary; although you should firmly adhere to the Bible, and offer to express your belief in the very words of inspiration, and continue to exhibit a Christian temper and character.

'And is not this use of the human creed subversive of free inquiry, religious liberty, and the principles of congregationalism? For, what inquiries have you liberty to pursue? Would you inquire into the truth of your creed, so as to correct any errors that may pertain to this human composition? No. This liberty you have sacrificed. You must never presume to make a single alteration in this human formulary; but you and your successors must sacredly use it as the perfect standard of religious truth FOR EVER. For so you are bound to conduct, by the following authoritative injunction from the constitution of your Seminary. "It is *strictly* and *solemnly* enjoined, and *left in sacred charge*, that *every* article of the *above said creed* shall

for ever remain entirely and identically the same, without the least alteration, addition, or diminution." — Would you inquire into the meaning of the Scriptures, so as to communicate to your pupils the result of your investigations? No. This liberty you have sacrificed. You have bound yourself most firmly to make your religious instructions conform exactly to the sentiments of the human creed. These are the words of your solemn obligation. "And furthermore I do solemnly promise, that I will open and explain the Scriptures to my pupils with integrity and faithfulness; that I will maintain and inculcate the Christian faith, as expressed in the creed, by me now repeated." — Would you inquire into the peculiar religious opinions of other Christian denominations, so as to ascertain if their belief is not founded on the plain teachings of inspiration? No. This liberty you have sacrificed. You have pledged yourself to regard the sentiments of other sects as erroneous, and to defend your creed in opposition to all who dissent from any of its articles. These are the words of your sacred oath. "And furthermore I do solemnly promise, that I will maintain and inculcate the Christian faith, as expressed in the creed, by me now repeated, — in opposition to Papists, Arians, Pelagians, Antinomians, Arminians, Socinians, Sabellians, Unitarians, and Universalists, and to all other heresies and errors, ancient or modern." — Should a prayerful study of the Bible enable you to discover a slight error in some one article of this long creed, could you retain your situation as Professor? No. This liberty you have sacrificed. The moment you advance in religious knowledge and truth one step beyond the ideas of this human formulary, you must vacate your office; you must be cast on the wide world with a dependent family; you must encounter coldness and frowns and reproaches from your former associates; you must be privately and publicly denounced as an apostate, a heretic, an infidel; and above all, you must be sentenced to endless torments for your honest preference of the teachings of revelation to the articles of a human creed, if treated as others have been who have embraced Unitarianism. These are the words of your constitution. "The preceding Creed and Declaration shall be repeated by every Professor on this foundation, at the expiration of every successive period of five years; and no man shall be continued a Professor on said foundation, who shall not continue to approve himself a man of sound and orthodox principles in divinity, AGREEABLY TO THE AFORESAID CREED." Sir, is this the way you show your respect and reverence for the Bible? Is this the way you divest yourself of all party prejudices, when you proceed to search the

Scriptures? Is this the way you prepare yourself to investigate religious subjects with honesty, and boldness, and fearlessness? Is this the way you enjoy the meridian splendor of free inquiry, religious liberty, and the principles of congregationalism?

‘But perhaps you will aver, that there is no possible danger of your ever dissenting from the sentiments of this human creed. Then why all these fortifications? And have not many divines, as wise, as learned, as honest, as pious as yourself, been led, by a patient and prayerful study of the Scriptures, to renounce their belief in the peculiarities of your standard of religious truth? Is it not a fact, that one of the principal founders of your institution, one of the principal framers of this very creed, and one of the earliest Professors in your seminary, became a Liberal Christian after dissolving his connexion with your theological faculty, and warmly opposed to many of your illiberal and exclusive measures? Is it not a fact, that several ministers, who pursued the regular course of theological studies in your institution, and who were regarded as amongst the most talented, the most learned, the most sincere, the most pious of your students, have since embraced Unitarian sentiments? Is it not a fact, that several others, of high standing and good Christian character, were led to renounce Orthodox views, even before they had completed the usual term of education in your Seminary? Is it not a fact, that many of the most distinguished Unitarian preachers of the age were once as zealously orthodox as you now are? Is it not a fact, that every year witnesses the conversion of more or fewer orthodox ministers to the Unitarian faith? And could you be placed in similar circumstances, what would prevent similar results? I do not mean to insinuate that you are knowingly influenced by your peculiar oaths and obligations to make the Scriptures bend to the articles of your creed. But I must be permitted to declare, that almost all earthly motives which can operate on the human heart, combine to make it your interest to find none but orthodox views in the Bible?” — pp. 6 — 8.

One would suppose that a proper sense of human frailty, and the obligations of truth, would prevent Professor Stuart from exposing his mind to influences that must have a tendency, to say the least, to disturb the perfectly even and just balance, in which doubtful and conflicting testimonies and authorities should be weighed. His moral and religious principles may convince us, that he will not allow himself to be biased and corrupted knowingly by such influences; but what security can the public or his pupils have, nay what

security can he himself have, that he will not be biased and corrupted by them unconsciously? The Professors at Andover are understood to investigate thoroughly the great controverted doctrines of the day; and the results of these investigations would be entitled to much respect, if we did not know beforehand, by the rules and statutes of their respective foundations, what these results must be. We have no wish to detract at all from Professor Stuart's well-earned reputation for learning and ability; but on these doctrines what avails it? '*Fabulas et errores ab imperitis parentibus discimus; et, quod est gravius, ipsis studiis et disciplinis elaboramus.*' Still it is not unlikely that Professor Stuart honestly believes, that the interests of truth, or at least of Orthodoxy, forbid that a public teacher of Christianity, in these days of daring speculation and constant change, should be allowed to throw off the trammels of a creed. He holds, perhaps, that it may be right, consistent, and safe in Unitarians to assert and enjoy such freedom, but that it would not be right, consistent, or safe in the Orthodox. Orthodoxy, he may think, would not long survive in this country, if theological professors everywhere were left without any other guide or standard in their investigations, and teachings, but the Bible. He may, therefore, disown and reject entire religious liberty, on principle; but if he does so, let him take this ground ingenuously, openly, and fearlessly. Let him not disown and reject entire religious liberty, in theory and practice, and on principle too; and in the same breath deny that he has disowned and rejected it, and claim to be regarded as its friend.

The same want of precision and accuracy which Professor Stuart evinces in what he says of religious liberty, he also shows, in speaking of the charges which Dr. Channing has brought against its violators. He even mistakes, or affects to mistake, the persons of the accused. He says in his Letter;

'I take it for granted that you yourself are altogether too frank and ingenuous, even to pretend that you did not mean to characterize Orthodox Christians in general throughout this State, and in particular the clergy who belong to this denomination of Christians. And I take this for granted, because I cannot help believing that no Unitarian who reads your writings, has ever once suspected, or ever will suspect, that you meant to characterize any other than the Orthodox; and no

Orthodox man who reads the whole of your works, can possibly suppose otherwise. You aim at *real* existences, not *imaginary, future, fantastic* ones ; I mean those which you believe to be real. The friends with whom I am accustomed to think and act, do not once suspect you of laying out your energies, in belaboring what you believe to be "a man of straw." — p. 8.

In another place he says ;

' In some solitary passages, you allow, for decency's sake, and in order to save the appearance of *liberality*, that there are some among us who have a share of common sense in respect to most subjects, and a few that have a little smattering of what the world deems learning ; possibly two or three Orthodox individuals may be found, in the whole State, that have a small degree of cultivated taste. But in other passages almost without number, you rank the whole together, and fearlessly avow that none but bigots, and those who have bid adieu to what little understanding they possessed, can be found in the ranks of Orthodoxy. And what is more than all, some of your partial friends applaud this, and call it bold and fearless declaration of the truth, and the developement of high and commanding genius.' — p. 10.

Again, he says ;

' If now you can establish the *facts*, which you have alleged, and which go to make up the charges in question, in respect to the Orthodox as a body in this Commonwealth, confession and humiliation in this whole affair undoubtedly will belong to us. If you cannot prove it of the *whole*, then the sweeping accusations which you have made are to be modified, greatly modified.' — p. 39.

Are we then to believe that Dr. Channing has denounced the "whole" Orthodox denomination as fools, bigots, and persecutors, and that he has done this in "passages almost without number." Professor Stuart knows better. Dr. Channing has spoken repeatedly and with great plainness of Calvinism generally, and its moral aspects and tendencies ; but in doing so he has been careful to say that he was not speaking of Calvinists, nor of the actual influences of the system in this community. He believes, and he has said again and again, that, in a well-informed community like ours, the natural and legitimate tendencies of the system are modified in all cases, and sometimes almost entirely neutralized,

by the operation of other causes. At the same time we do not mean to deny, that he has occasionally spoken of men, and of a party, and denounced their measures as subversive of free inquiry and religious liberty. But this party is not the whole Orthodox denomination, nor the Orthodox denomination as a body. It is the Exclusive party, a party organized and spread over the whole country, composed of members belonging to different sects, and holding different opinions, but agreeing in this, that the Christian name and all Christian privileges and fellowship shall be withheld from those who do not come up to a certain standard, which they in their wisdom, or their presumption, have seen fit to prescribe. This party was introduced and established in Massachusetts but about twenty years ago; and up to this hour, it has hardly brought over to a cordial coöperation in its views a majority of the Orthodox clergy, and not one twentieth part of the Orthodox laity. It was this party which in 1815 proposed to institute a Plan of Ecclesiastical Order amongst us, but was resisted, and utterly defeated in the attempt, by the almost unanimous voice of the Orthodox churches. It is this party which has been presenting petition after petition to the General Court, in the hope of obtaining legislative countenance and sanction, in some form or other, to its exclusive measures; but its projects have been exposed and rejected in every instance by overwhelming majorities. It is this party, which, for some years back, has been bringing forward a succession of exclusive and schismatic resolutions in the Massachusetts Convention of Congregational Ministers, but has never been so far supported by the Orthodox as to be able to carry them through, though more than two thirds of the Convention are of that denomination. It is of this party that the Rev. Mr. Withington of Newbury, himself a distinguished Orthodox divine, speaks as follows;

“To illustrate our manners, if ever this book should fall into the hands of a foreigner, let me mention in a note, a circumstance which is certainly unworthy of a place in the text. In Massachusetts, for a few years past, all ecclesiastical measures have been prepared *in a certain conclave*, nobody knows who they are, or where they are, invisible beings, *congregational cardinals*, to whose decrees every Orthodox clergyman and church is expected to pay unlimited deference and submission. But as

they are wholly destitute of power, they have found out a singular way of executing their laws. *The clergyman, who hesitates, OR DARES TO THINK OR ACT FOR HIMSELF*, suddenly finds himself surrounded by the whisper, that he is becoming an UNITARIAN. It is not easy to conceive the horror and dismay, that this suggestion occasions. It is caught from mouth to mouth, and whispered from ear to ear, and every ghastly relater increases the terrors of the tale. The poor, affrighted victim must either return to the bosom of the church, *the popular measure of the day, or be denounced a heretic*, worthy of all the flames that detraction can kindle; for, in this country, we burn heretics in no other." — *Cited by Whitman, p. 24.*

The views entertained of this party by many Orthodox clergymen who are constrained by threatening and intimidation to come into its plans, and submit to its impositions, may be gathered from an incident of recent occurrence.

'The circumstances are briefly these. A Unitarian minister of Salem, in company with an influential layman of Andover, called on an Orthodox minister of Middlesex county, to obtain an exchange for the following Sabbath. As the Orthodox minister had before preached in Salem, he addressed to him the following observation; "I hope you are not getting into the exclusive system." The reply contained the following sentiments, according to the testimony of the layman now before me. "I *abhor the system*, but am *compelled* to enter into it; for *THEY* have told me, if I do not join them, *they will fall upon me and break up my parish.*" The layman immediately repeated this very appropriate proverb; "The fear of man bringeth a snare." — p. 19.

Professor Stuart may have had his reasons, though not a shadow of evidence, for representing Dr. Channing as assailing the whole Orthodox denomination. It would give to many of his remarks an air of extravagance and injustice, excite against him in a large and respectable body of Christians a feeling of personal injury and affront, and blind the public generally, not only to the merits of the controversy, but to the real question at issue, and the parties implicated. We repeat it, however, the party aimed at by Dr. Channing is not the Orthodox, but the Exclusive party, a party still inconsiderable, at least in Massachusetts, so far as numbers are concerned; but formidable from its talent, activity, and unscrupulous zeal, and especially from the undue influence it has gained over Orthodox institutions and publications. In

this vicinity, it has been formed and managed, for the most part, by strangers, by men who have come among us from other states, though in their attempts to remodel our notions and usages according to those under which they were educated, they have found it convenient to talk very familiarly about 'Old Massachusetts,' and the 'Home of the Pilgrims,' and to say, '*we*.' Now Dr. Channing has had the temerity to think and say, that, in matters of religion and conscience, it is not precisely the thing to be expected or desired, that the great body of native citizens of this Commonwealth should submit to the dictation of such a 'conclave.'

In resisting the measures and exposing the policy of these men, he has also found it necessary to charge them, either directly or by implication, with endeavouring, perhaps under the influence of a sincere though mistaken zeal for religion, to restrain and overawe a fair and free investigation of truth. This they have not been so weak as to think of doing in this country by civil penalties and disabilities, but by attempting to institute among us new ecclesiastical judicatories, by a frequent infliction of ecclesiastical censures and penalties for mere differences of opinion, and by calumny, denunciation, and menace.

With regard to the attempt which was made by the party in question to introduce among us new ecclesiastical judicatories, in imitation of the Consociations of Connecticut, Dr. Channing, in 1815, expressed himself thus ;

'We are now threatened with new tribunals, or Consociations, whose office it will be to try ministers for their errors, to inspect the churches, and to advise and assist them in the extirpation of "heresy." Whilst the laity are slumbering, the ancient and free constitution of our churches is silently undermined, and is crumbling away. Since argument is insufficient to produce uniformity of opinion, recourse must be had to more powerful instruments of conviction ; I mean, to ECCLESIASTICAL COURTS. And are this people indeed prepared to submit to this most degrading form of vassalage ; a vassalage, which reaches and palsies the mind, and imposes on it the dreams and fictions of men, for the everlasting truth of God !' — *Discourses, &c.*, p. 566.

This passage contains one of those accusations, of which Professor Stuart says, 'I do know that' they 'are not true. I aver that they are not, before heaven and earth.' Not satisfied with a general denial of this particular charge, he

reverts to the subject afterwards, and makes it the occasion of some ill-timed pleasantry.

‘In respect to such of us as profess to be Congregationalists, neither yourself, nor any man on earth, has a right to deny that we are sincere in this profession. How, then, can we have it in view to erect *ecclesiastical judicatories and courts which are to try and punish heretics as criminals*? Why, Sir, the suggestion of such a thing among *Congregationalists*, is just as if one were to ask, under the present form of our government in this State, “What day is appointed for the *coronation* of the Governor?” And the fact that you even suggest such a thing, shows, either that you regard us as hypocrites in professing to be Congregationalists; or — shall I say it? — that you make assertions of this nature, without even knowing what Congregationalism admits or rejects.’ — p. 40.

That the tribunals in question are really inconsistent with Congregationalism, Dr. Channing not only knew, but expressly affirmed, in the very paragraph, which Professor Stuart has cited from his writings. But he also knew, that there were those professing to be Congregationalists, who held, and acted on, a different doctrine. Has Professor Stuart forgotten, that the consociated churches in his native State call themselves Congregational, and that they are consociated for the special purpose of establishing a regular and permanent ecclesiastical court or judicatory of the kind which Dr. Channing has denounced? Has he no recollection of the case of the Rev. Abiel Abbot, formerly minister of Coventry, who was tried before the Consociation of Tolland County, in 1811, on a charge of heresy, and found guilty and deposed? Will he deny, in the face of the record, that this minister, with a character as unimpeachable in other respects as that of any one of his brethren in the State, was ‘tried’ before an ‘*ecclesiastical court*’ for his supposed errors in belief, and condemned and ‘punished’? Suppose that Mr. Abbot had been deposed by a civil and not by an ecclesiastical court, and for a crime against the State and not against religion. In this case, it is true, he would have been tried and punished under a different jurisdiction, and for a different sort of crime; but it is not true, that there would have been any more reason to say, that he had been tried and punished, or that he had been tried and punished as a criminal. It is to no purpose to object here, that the

churches in Connecticut consociated voluntarily ; that it was in all respects, so far as the churches were concerned, a voluntary arrangement ; a measure which was not forced upon them, but one which they adopted of their own accord, believing it to be expedient and right. We are not now inquiring how tribunals, like those which Dr. Channing has described, have been introduced and established, or on what principles they are defended, but whether they have ever really existed among such ' as profess to be Congregationalists.' Professor Stuart will hardly presume to aver again, that they have not. Whence then this bluster, and affectation of astonishment, at the pretended inconsistency and absurdity of Dr. Channing's imputations.

It would be well for Professor Stuart if his responsibility in regard to these imputations ended here. Dr. Channing, writing in 1815, had taken the liberty to warn the public against a project, which was known to be on foot at that time, to introduce and establish among the Congregational churches of this State something like the Connecticut plan of Consociations. As this project, in all its details, exhibits in a strong light the principles and real aim of the Exclusive party, we shall give from Mr. Whitman's letters a succinct and well digested narration of the facts.

' In 1814, a body of Orthodox ministers assembled in Dorchester. There were twenty-four belonging to this Commonwealth, as delegates from twelve ministerial associations. They called themselves the *General Association of Massachusetts* ; by what right or authority, I am unable to determine. There were also present two delegates from the Presbyterian church ; and two from each of the Orthodox Conventions of Connecticut, Vermont, and New Hampshire. Some of the leaders of the Massachusetts delegation wished to introduce the Connecticut system of Consociations ; but they well knew, that an open avowal of their design would be rejected by many of their own denomination. They accordingly commenced their undertaking by passing the following votes. " Voted, to hear and take order upon the measures proposed in an ancient document, prepared ' to serve the great intentions of religion, which is lamentably decaying in the country,' by the ministers of Massachusetts, convened in Boston in the year 1704, 5, and 6." The following vote was then passed unanimously. " Whereas an ancient document has been presented to this Association, containing an answer to the question, ' What further steps are to be taken, that councils may have

their due constitution and efficacy, in supporting, preserving, and well ordering the interests of the churches in this country?' and assented to by the delegates of the Associations met according to former agreement at Boston, September 13th, 1705, and 'further approved and confirmed by a general Convention of ministers at Boston, 30th 3d month, 1706'—Voted, that a committee of seven be chosen by ballot, to inquire into the history of the above-mentioned document; and particularly to ascertain, whether the resolves it contains were carried into execution at the time, and to what extent; *and to report at the next annual meeting of this Association, on the expediency of a recommendation by this body of the plan of discipline therein proposed, either entire, or with alterations and amendments*, to the consideration of the associations and churches in our connexion. Rev. Jedidiah Morse, D. D., Rev. Samuel Austin, D. D., Rev. Leonard Woods, D. D., Rev. Samuel Worcester, D. D., Rev. Enoch Hale, Rev. Joseph Lyman, D. D., and the Rev. Timothy M. Cooley, were chosen a committee for the purpose above specified." Such was the display, and caution, and management necessary to bring forward the proposed change in the government of our congregational churches.

'After the passing of these votes, the publishing committee were directed to print and distribute a hundred and fifty copies of the minutes of the Association. They performed the specified duty, and appended to the minutes a copy of the famous document. They assure us, that it has never before been published to their knowledge, and that it is "an INVALUABLE RELIC of our pious forefathers." Now the history of this invaluable relic is soon related. It was a plan for the destruction of our congregational form of church government, drawn up by Cotton Mather, and raked out of his musty papers. It was printed soon after it was written, by the Rev. John Wise, of Ipswich. It was recommended to the adoption of the churches in that early period, and by them quickly rejected. And why? Let Cotton Mather answer for himself. "There were *some very considerable persons among the ministers, as well as of the brethren, who thought the liberties of particular churches to be in danger of being limited and infringed by its adoption. In deference to these*, the proposals were never prosecuted beyond the bounds of mere proposals." All this should have been known to some one or more of the General Association who make such pretences to an acquaintance with the proceedings of our Pilgrim fathers. Still all this parade and artifice were necessary to keep the suspicions of the free people of this State in profound quiet, and receive the attention and coöperation of the more liberal of the Orthodox denomination.'—pp. 32, 33.

The General Association met at Royalston on the twenty-seventh of June, 1815, and the committee who were to inquire into the history of the 'invaluable' document, reported that its proposals were such as Congregational ministers could not consistently recommend or approve. They went on, however, to speak of the defects in the existing system of ecclesiastical discipline, and dwelt particularly on our want of a competent and acknowledged tribunal before which whole churches might be arraigned and tried on a charge of 'apostasy,' and 'of a settled and effectual method of calling ministers to account for immorality and error.' The committee concluded with proposing 'a Plan of Ecclesiastical Order.'

'Well, Sir,' Mr. Whitman continues, 'after this elaborate report had been read, the Association chose the Rev. Drs. Morse, Codman, and Woods, a committee to have it printed and circulated in the several associations in their connexion, "*for the purpose of ascertaining the PUBLIC sentiment respecting the plan of ecclesiastical order therein presented.*" And what is the character of this new plan? The committee recommend, that *the churches shall explicitly adopt and put in practice the following articles of agreement.* — *First*, the propositions of the synod of 1662 are acknowledged as the *basis of Consociations.* *Secondly*, particular Consociations shall be formed within certain limits. In this article there is a wonderfully generous provision, that churches *not* joining the Consociation shall *not be treated* as parties. *Thirdly*, provision is made for the regular meetings of the new ecclesiastical tribunal. *Fourthly*, each Consociation is indulged with the privilege of choosing its own moderator and scribe. *Fifthly*, this constitution is declared to be the constitution of all Consociations in the general body; yet each separate Consociation has the privilege of adopting such regulations as are not repugnant to this constitution; that is, saving in all cases the papal power and supremacy. *Sixthly*, by this extraordinary article, the *Consociation* is substituted for *mutual councils* in *all* ages, and without the express consent of the parties; and in defiance of our State constitution and republican principles, is declared to be the *legal* and competent tribunal for the following solemn purposes: — *to hear and decide upon any complaint* and allegation, touching ministerial character, against any minister belonging to it; *to acquit or find guilty, to advise, maintain, or DEPOSE,* as the case may require. Then comes the quintessence of ecclesiastical despotism. It is to be understood, however, that any Consociation may provide, upon principles and for reasons dis-

tinently to be made known to them, for *cases* in which it may not be *expedient* for *all the members* to be concerned; as also for *cases*, in which it may be proper for *others not of the body*, to be admitted to sit in the council. Now, what are the true and only purposes of this formal and technical rule, when reduced to plain English? Simply these. The Consociation is, to all future time, made by a fiction the *mutual* choice of both parties; but through fear that heresy might even infect the Consociation itself, it is provided, that the Consociation may exclude any member at pleasure from any trial; and admit others not members of the particular Consociation to sit therein. That is, it is permitted to each Consociation in all cases to *pack a jury*, provided it be for the justifiable purpose of deposing an heretical minister. There was, indeed, a right of appeal to two or more neighbouring Consociations, except for private church members; they were to be condemned without appeal. Such is a bare synopsis of this proposed plan of ecclesiastical order.

‘Now what is proved by the history of this report? First, that the committee who drew it up consisted of the ablest men in the denomination. Secondly, that they approved their own plan, and wished it carried into execution. Thirdly, that the Association so far approved of its scope, design, principles, and objects, as to submit it to the associations in their connexion. And, fourthly, that the new plan of ecclesiastical order contained all the worst features of the Connecticut system of Consociations.’ — pp. 35, 36.

‘And how was this plan of ecclesiastical order received by the community? With marked disapprobation. It produced nearly as much talk and excitement throughout the Commonwealth, as the recent revolutions in Europe are now producing among our free citizens. Its adoption was opposed by all classes of society; and especially by some distinguished individuals of Orthodox sentiments. Among others, one of the founders of your Seminary, the Rev. Dr. Spring of Newburyport, attacked the plan with great power and success. He declares in his pamphlet, that “the plan of ecclesiastical order is not authorized by reason or revelation”; that it is not “friendly to the liberty and rights of conscience”; that it “will invest clergymen especially with more influence over their churches than they ought to possess”; that it is an infringement of the rights of distinct branches of the church and of individual brethren”; that “it exceeds the plan of the Fathers very far indeed, by placing the communion of churches under the care and management of standing councils or Consociations; and by making all ministers in the connexion amenable directly to the Consociation, instead of their own church and occasional

councils"; and "that, if it succeed, it will introduce a revolution amid our churches." "On the whole," says the Doctor, "we sincerely think, that the genius and habits of the good people of this State are so averse to arbitrary and aristocratic government or domination, that the measures contemplated will not meet that share of public approbation, which promises utility to Zion." Is not this Orthodox authority sufficient to convince you that Dr. Channing uttered the truth, and nothing but the truth, when he published the following sentence, which you have so often quoted and ridiculed. "It is a melancholy fact, that our long established Congregational form of church government is menaced, and tribunals unknown to our churches, and unknown, as we believe, to the Scriptures, are to be introduced; and introduced for the very purpose, that the supposed errors and mistakes of ministers and private Christians may be tried and punished as heresies, that is, as crimes." The writings of Dr. Spring and Dr. Channing did much to awaken public attention to the threatened danger. But a publication of the Hon. John Lowell produced a much greater effect; because it gave a full view of the enormous evils to be inflicted on the churches by the new plan of ecclesiastical order; and because it was published in several different parts of the Commonwealth, and in this manner very generally circulated through the community. So that this wonderful child of many fathers barely breathed to expire under the maledictions of a free Christian people.' — pp. 36, 37.

Candid men of all parties, on becoming acquainted with these facts, will entirely concur, we are sure, with Mr. Whitman in the following severe but just animadversions in his concluding paragraph on this subject.

'Now, Sir, permit me to ask you a few friendly questions. In your treatment of Dr. Channing on this particular point, have you not been guilty of *singular unfairness*? Just review the circumstances of the case. An attempt was made by the leaders of the Orthodox party, in 1815, to change the ecclesiastical order of our congregational churches. At the very time, Dr. Channing wrote an able article to prevent its success. Distinguished men of Orthodox sentiments entertained similar views of the design, and also warned the community to guard against the threatened danger. By such noble exertions, a great excitement was produced throughout the Commonwealth, and the nefarious attempt was blown to perdition. After fifteen years Dr. Channing collects most of his writings into a large volume; and among other articles, republishes the above mentioned essay, taking special care to date it, *eighteen hundred*

and fifteen. In that essay he simply asserts what every body knew to be literally true at the time of publication. As soon as this volume is well before the public, with much blustering you boldly declare, that this assertion of Dr. Channing is not true. You bring forward the quotation several times, and ridicule the idea of any such attempt on the part of the Orthodox. You treat an opinion of fifteen years' standing, which was an undisputed truth at the time of its publication, as the sentiment of the present year. Is not this most singular unfairness?' — p. 38.

The avowed object of the Exclusive party in endeavouring to introduce a new plan of ecclesiastical order was to provide more prompt and effectual means for enforcing discipline, especially in regard to reputed heresies, or defections from the popular faith. Failing utterly, however, in this attempt, they were obliged to fall back on the usual modes of inflicting ecclesiastical censures and penalties; but these modes they contrived to make much more efficient and formidable than heretofore, by incorporating into church covenants a more full and exact statement of their belief, and by keeping a strict watch, not only over the conduct, but over the feelings and opinions of church members. Thus do they continue to adhere to the forms of Congregationalism; but not, as we conceive, without violating its spirit, and going contrary to the principles and precedents of the Pilgrim fathers. We cannot resist the inclination to quote a passage from the mass of interesting testimonies and documents on this subject with which Mr. Whitman has favored the public.

'A good authority thus observes. "While they take care, according to Apostolic injunction, that all things be done decently and in order, it is *their duty not to impose any thing, by way of subscription or declaration of faith, upon those who desire admission to the ordinances, which may not be conscientiously complied with by sincere Christians of all denominations.*" Your friend, Dr. Hawes, has also declared, that the Pilgrims "*acted on the principle of open communion; making evidence of Christian character the ONLY condition of fellowship!*" I thank the gentleman for what little truth his *tribute* contains. I suppose this evidence is sufficient; but I choose to advance more. I will give you a specimen of covenants adopted by our Pilgrim fathers, to convince you, that they did not hedge up the entrance to the Lord's table with doctrinal tests and human standards of divine truth; but that they opened the door to all sincere Christians of every denomination. The church first planted in Plymouth was organized

before they reached our shores. The covenant they then adopted has not been preserved. But about fifty years after their landing, a public fast was held, and they renewed their covenant engagements. The records of the church thus read. "A church covenant was read; and the church voted, that it should be left on record *as that which they did own to be the substance of that covenant, which their fathers entered into at the first gathering of the church*; which was in the words following.

"In the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, and in obedience to his holy ordinances, we being by the most wise and good providence of God brought together in this place, and desirous to unite ourselves into one congregation or church, under the Lord Jesus Christ our Head, that we may be in such root as becometh all those whom he hath redeemed and sanctified to himself, we do hereby solemnly and religiously, as in his most holy presence, avouch the Lord Jehovah, the only true God, to be our God and the God of ours; and do promise and bind ourselves to walk in all our ways according to the rule of the Gospel, and in all sincere conformity to his holy ordinances, and in mutual love to, and watchfulness over one another, depending wholly and only upon the Lord our God to enable us by his grace hereunto." pp. 131, 132.

Mr. Whitman subjoins authentic copies of the original covenants of the first church in Salem, and the first church in Boston, which are equally free with that of Plymouth from every thing which looks like pledging the communicants to a particular profession of faith.

With these documents before us it is hardly possible not to perceive, that the creed-covenants adopted in most Orthodox churches are a wide departure from the principles of primitive Congregationalism. Professor Stuart may say, that every member of an Orthodox church knows, on entering it, what are the special obligations which he incurs; so that, if he fails to fulfil them, he has no right so complain at being ejected. This, however, admitting it to be true in its full extent, would only prove, that the individual after having voluntarily submitted to such an arrangement, has no just ground of complaint, so far as he is personally concerned; but it would not prove, or imply in any way, that the arrangement itself is not illiberal and intolerant. Besides, from what is he ejected? Not merely from a private society calling itself the church; not merely from a voluntary association of men and women bound together by certain articles of

agreement, and conditions of membership, — but from public religious ordinances, in which he believes it to be not only his right, but his duty to join. Nobody doubts, we presume, that a number of persons holding Orthodox opinions, have a right to form themselves into a voluntary association, and make an assent to these opinions a condition of membership; and having done so, they have a right to exclude all such as will not adopt these opinions, or have discarded them, from the privileges of the association. We say, from the privileges of the association; by which we mean the privileges which belong to the association exclusively, or which it has an undisputed prerogative to bestow or withhold according to its pleasure. If, not satisfied with doing this, it proceeds to exclude men, merely on the ground of its conditions of membership, not only from the privileges of the association, but from the Christian ordinances, its members are guilty of precisely the same sort of usurpation in religion, which our forefathers were guilty of in civil matters, when they excluded all who did not belong to the church from the rights of freemen and citizens.

It is to no purpose to urge, therefore, that the Exclusive party has renounced all intention to resort to civil disabilities and penalties, as a means of checking the growth of heresy, and is resolved at length to rely altogether on religious disabilities and penalties. The former is not more a usurpation than the latter, and the practical tendency of both alike is to repress freedom of thought, and deter men from an open and fearless avowal of their convictions. Dr. Channing never said, or intimated, that it was part of the policy of Exclusionists in this state to call in the civil power to forbid and restrain the free and unbiased investigation of truth; but he has charged them with resorting to other expedients for this purpose, and among the rest, as we have seen, to an abuse of ecclesiastical discipline.

Another means of restraining Christian liberty and preventing the free and unbiased investigation of truth, of which the more zealous and unscrupulous of the Exclusive party have not hesitated to avail themselves, has been personal detraction and obloquy. We do not refer here to their denial of the Christian name and character to Unitarians on account of their belief, but to the suspicions which they have endeavoured to propagate, respecting the honesty and

sincerity of Unitarian ministers, and liberal Christians generally.

‘So many instances of this kind now rush on my recollection,’ says Mr. Whitman, ‘that I find it difficult to make a selection. One example is this. A Unitarian minister, the son of an Orthodox clergyman, was ordained over a society in Plymouth county. An Orthodox Christian in the vicinity took pains to circulate the report, that this man preached his father’s Orthodox sermons; and that there was an open disagreement between the sentiments of his discourses and his Unitarian prayers. — Another instance is this. An Orthodox deacon in Middlesex county reported that a Unitarian minister in a neighbouring town had declared to his people, that he did not believe a word of the Bible. — A third case is this. An Orthodox clergyman in this county informed a lady who had left his meeting, that the Unitarian preacher in the same town preached sentiments which he did not himself believe. — A fourth instance is this. Two Orthodox ministers were travelling in the stage with two Unitarian church-members. One of them asserted, that the present Professor of Pulpit Eloquence and Pastoral Care in the University at Cambridge, then residing in Europe for his health, had renounced Christianity, and become an infidel. — As a fifth example, I will take one of the multitude which have been circulated respecting myself. The Orthodox minister in this place has lately stated, that when I was journeying in New Hampshire, last season, I called at the house of an Orthodox lady; that she asked me if I “was willing to enter the eternal world with my present views and feelings”; that after remaining silent and thoughtful some time, I boldly answered — “No,” I was not willing. Whether the Reverend gentleman believed this story when he circulated it or not, is not for me to determine. I must however say, that had I believed a similar report concerning him, I should not have whispered it about among a few females; but I should have felt it my duty to expose his hypocrisy by proclaiming the evidence on the house-top. I now declare that the statement is an absolute falsehood, made out of whole cloth, having not even the shadow of a circumstance in truth for a foundation.’ — pp. 94, 95.

‘Take a notorious instance which occurred about two years since. The circumstances are briefly these. The Rev. Mr. Hubbard, a minister of acknowledged Orthodox sentiments, and late pastor of the church in Middleton, was invited to a re-settlement over the congregational society in Lunenburg. It was generally known to his ministerial brethren, that he was in the practice of exchanging with Unitarians. This circumstance *alone* induc-

ed some Orthodox preachers in the vicinity of Lunenburg to make great exertions to prevent his installation. And what measures do you suppose they adopted to effect this object? I grieve for the iniquity of the individuals concerned, while I record their wicked transactions. They went to Andover, and earnestly solicited from the Orthodox ministers in the neighbourhood of Middleton some information derogatory to the character of Mr. Hubbard. False and slanderous reports were invented by an individual in Middleton, communicated to an Orthodox minister in Danvers, and conveyed by him to the principal agent in this unrighteous work. The Rev. Mr. Payson of Leominster, having obtained the desired misrepresentations, went into Lunenburg, communicated them to an influential family, and requested them to put them in circulation and conceal the name of their informer. He affirmed, that Mr. Hubbard was a bad man, brought up his children to swear, and would prove a curse to the society if they retained him as their pastor. Such reports now threw the parish into consternation, and reached the ears of the pastor elect. He proceeded immediately to the source of the evil, and eventually dragged to light the individuals concerned. By the terrors of the civil law, he compelled them to confess their wickedness and agency in the base undertaking.

‘I will now give you a copy of three confessions. Take first that of the Rev. Mr. Braman of Danvers. It will show you that he was earnestly beset by Orthodox ministers for information injurious to the reputation of Mr. Hubbard. Here it is. “Whereas, in consequence of earnest solicitation from clergymen in the vicinity of Lunenburg, I made statements of reports which were injurious to the character of Rev. Mr. Hubbard; I hereby declare, that from persons in Middleton who belonged to the society of which Rev. Mr. Hubbard was pastor, in whose veracity I have entire confidence, I have received free testimonials of his moral and ministerial character; and that having been at considerable pains to make inquiries, I now declare it to be my conviction, that all rumors prejudicial to his moral reputation are destitute of foundation, and I hereby express my *sincere regret and sorrow*, that I was the instrument of circulating the reports in question.”

‘Take next the confession of the Rev. Mr. Payson, who went into Lunenburg to circulate the slanderous reports. He was afterwards asked before witnesses, if he should have taken such a step, had not Mr. Hubbard exchanged with Unitarians. His answer was—No. He also intimated, that Mr. Putnam of Fitchburg and Mr. Fisher of Harvard, in connexion with himself, had taken Lunenburg under their special protection. Many other particulars of a similar character might be mentioned to his disadvantage, did my limits or inclination permit. Let us then have

his confession. "This certifies to all whom it may concern, that some time during the month of October last, from information received from a person in whom I confided, I made certain statements to Edmund and Elizabeth Proctor of Lunenburg, and to some other individuals, unfavorable and derogatory to the ministerial and moral character of Rev. Ebenezer Hubbard, now pastor of the congregational church in Lunenburg; which statements have been ascertained by my informant to be false and groundless, of which evidence has been presented to me; therefore, on the ground of this evidence, I do now declare my belief that the said statements are false and groundless. And I further declare my sincere regret, that any statements made by me, from misapprehension, or any other cause, though I would not implicate any one individual, should have been magnified into public reports injurious to the private character of Rev. Mr. Hubbard, which I have no wish to impeach, and in regard to which I know nothing injurious or derogatory."

"I will, lastly give you the confession of the Orthodox gentleman in Middleton, who originated these slanderous reports. As he writes like a true penitent, I shall withhold his name from the public; for I have no wish to injure his reputation, and I trust his own conscience will inflict the most severe punishment for such aggravated wickedness. Here it is. "Be it known to all whom it may concern, that I have, during the year last past, been circulating reports that are highly injurious to the moral and ministerial character of Rev. Ebenezer Hubbard, late minister of this town. I have made statements dishonorable to him and his children, to ministers and other individuals with whom I have been conversant. I now freely acknowledge and publicly declare, that the statements made by me at any time, and to any person against Mr. Hubbard's character, are false and groundless, unprovoked and slanderous; and I take this method to make public my sorrow and regret, that I *have labored* to injure a man who never injured me, and whose moral character and conduct, I have reason to believe, as far as my knowledge extends, has been correct. I also further declare, that I never heard Mr. Hubbard's children use profane language. *Middleton, April 24th, 1829.*" — pp. 16 — 18.

We would not be misunderstood. So far are we from regarding the whole Orthodox denomination as responsible for these misrepresentations and calumnies, that we would not charge them, or a deliberate connivance in them, on Exclusionists as a body. Nay, more; we are willing that the individuals who have actually invented and circulated them,

should make the most of the palliations, which they can find for their conduct in human frailty, in the authorities by which they have been misled, or in the power of prejudice and passion to blind men to the force, not only of argument, but of evidence. Still as Unitarians have been pursued, year after year, with a storm of abuse of this description, and as it has found its way into some of the most widely circulated Orthodox publications, one or two of which appear to have been instituted, and to be supported, for the special purpose of slandering liberal Christians, it is believed that we have a right to look upon it as among the means, by which not a few in the party would enforce the exclusive system. Indeed Professor Stuart himself admits as much as this, if we understand him aright, in a passage which does him more credit than any other in his Letter, and accords, it is but justice to add, with his general reputation, and the tenor of his numerous and valuable writings.

‘I am ready to concede, on my part, that I have seen and read things among the Orthodox, the manner of which I in some respects heartily disapproved. I have never thought, that to rail at our opponents was either Christian or courteous. Above all, every reflecting man must say, Nothing can be more improbable, than that this kind of proceeding will be likely to convince those who differ from us. Who will hear us with patience, when we begin our reproof by letting him know that we think him either a fool or a knave ?

‘I am not blinded to this by party zeal. I have seen some of it among those whom I warmly love and greatly respect. Perhaps I may have shown some of this same disposition in my own writings. If so, produce it, and I will tread that part under my feet, and make my atonement by unfeigned sorrow to an injured public, and to the injured cause of Christ. But if I have indulged in such a mode of writing, I am unconscious of it to myself. I disapprove it; I even abhor it; and yet I know that I am not proof against temptation, and that I am exposed to all the weaknesses and faults of those around me.’ — pp. 22, 23.

Still he thinks that there is ‘nothing in any recent’ Orthodox publications, ‘which can well compare,’ in this respect, with offensive passages in which the works of popular and distinguished Unitarians abound. Though aware how differently men in general are struck with the moral tone of controversial pieces, especially when able and spirited, according as they support or impugn their own views, we did not

expect, we confess, that Professor Stuart would venture to put the question at issue on this ground. That respectable and distinguished Unitarians, writing under strong provocations, have sometimes used expressions, which to their opponents appear unjust and contumelious, and to the sober and dispassionate, harsh and ill-advised, is not improbable. It is remarkable, however, of their most intemperate sallies, that, unlike the specimens which have been given of Orthodox misrepresentation and abuse, they are generally directed against opinions and not against men; and when directed against men, they are almost invariably in self-defence, and proceed on known and approved laws of evidence, and never, absolutely never, impute to the other party generally a total want either of moral or religious character. Besides, who was it, that, in 1815, began this war of recrimination? It is not enough considered, that in this controversy the Exclusionists are responsible not only for the false and injurious charges, which they have brought against Unitarians, but for the vehemence and indignation, with which these charges have sometimes been repelled. When all, who dared to reject the popular doctrine of the trinity, were stigmatized as the enemies of truth, and infidels in disguise, there were those who thought that a necessity, a stern necessity, was laid on them either to succumb to the aggressors, or denounce them as bigots. Professor Stuart speaks of '*recent* Orthodox publications,' as if there had been some improvement, of late, in that quarter; of which, however, we regret to say, that we cannot discern the faintest indication. We are not ignorant that the Exclusionists of New England, for some years back, have been gradually verging towards Unitarianism; but in the same proportion as they have done so, and probably to save their reputation for Orthodoxy with their brethren at the South, their virulence against Unitarians has been growing more and more bitter and concentrated.

There is, moreover, one form of denunciation, to which Exclusionists are addicted, and which Professor Stuart does not disclaim; nay, which he thinks to justify, if we understand him aright, on the ground of principle and consistency. Unitarians are represented as apostates from Christianity, and as having forfeited all title to the Christian name, and to Christian rights and privileges. On this subject Mr. Whitman has given us several apt quotations, accompanied by re-

marks of his own, which are pertinent and characteristic, but to which we have room merely to refer our readers.

We never could understand why a man's religious or Christian character should not be accounted as sacred and inviolable against wanton or unauthorized imputations, as his character in other respects. If Unitarians, in their conduct, evince a disregard for the Scriptures, or infidelity to Christ, or a want of piety, the public should know it. Let it be remembered, however, that it is a question not of doctrines and theories, but of character and life. We profess to be Christians; and Professor Stuart will admit that Christians, as such, are entitled to certain privileges, and have certain rights. These privileges we ask, these rights we demand, until our claims are disproved and rejected by a competent tribunal.

Professor Stuart seems to be aware of the correctness of this proposition, when it must be taken to protect Exclusionists from what he regards as unauthorized aspersions; for he asks Dr. Channing,

‘Will you say, that men have no right to be in earnest, in defending *bigotry*? I know you do say this; that is, you say what manifestly implies this. But then I am not to be diverted from my argument by such an answer. Who, I ask, has made the decision that Orthodoxy is *bigotry*? “Dr. Channing and his friends affirm it.” Granted; but in a land of *liberty*, there is a freedom of thought to be allowed; and by far the greater portion of our community have made up their minds, that there is no *bigotry* in the sentiments in question. But you, Sir, take for granted the very question in dispute; and taking this for granted, you decide just as though there was no appeal from your tribunal, and consign us over to the ranks of dark designing conspirators against the religious liberties of our country.’ — p. 21.

We readily concede, that merely to say that a man is a bigot, even though we say it in perfect sincerity, or merely to embrace principles which we honestly think must lead to bigotry, will not make a man a bigot, nor authorize us to treat him as if he were one. He may still insist on the ‘right to be judged by the fairest, the most approved, and the most settled rules, by which character can be tried.’ This is no more than justice to the Orthodox, and we confess we cannot see why it should be accounted any more than justice to Unitarians. Who has made the decision that Unitarians have

forfeited all pretensions to the Christian character? 'Professor Stuart and his friends affirm it.' Granted; but in a land of *liberty*, there is a freedom of thought to be allowed; and by far the greater portion of our community are not prepared to set down Unitarians indiscriminately either as Atheists or Deists. Professor Stuart and his friends take for granted the very question in dispute; and taking this for granted, they go on to act just as though there was no appeal from their tribunal, and consign us over to the ranks of the haters of truth, and enemies of God.

Some may still object, that the difficulty has not been fairly met.

'If I believe,' says Professor Stuart, 'that there are unequivocal declarations in God's word (as I truly do), in respect to these tremendous subjects; if I believe that the impenitent are surely exposed to endless misery; that those who reject the Saviour as he is offered in the Gospel, "shall not see life, but that the wrath of God will *abide* on them"; can I, as a man of any pretensions to benevolence, refrain from telling all this to others, from urging it upon them, and from warning them of the danger in which I sincerely believe them to be? Truly, the opponents of our religious views must halt here, and candidly avow, that if such are our real convictions, we ought in all good conscience to urge them upon our neighbours.

'Say, if you please, that we are utterly mistaken; that all our convictions are the result of superstition, or prejudice, or bigotry, or of a narrow, illiberal education; yet so long as we are in this plight, what are we to do? As honest men, we must follow the dictates of our consciences. We acknowledge the possibility that these may be blinded, or perverted, or even "seared"; but so long as we are not convinced that this is the case, how can we do otherwise than propagate our sentiments by all proper methods and with all the earnestness in our power?' — pp. 17, 18.

He cannot be serious, of course, in intimating that Dr. Channing or any other Unitarian, doubts the right of the Orthodox to avail themselves of all 'proper methods' for the propagation of their peculiarities; but what are 'proper methods,' that is the question. Those who talk so much about conscience in this connexion, appear to us to confound conscience with mere opinion. Will it be pretended, that any one has a right to take up a mere opinion, especially on a doubtful and difficult subject, respecting which

the wisest and best men in the community differ, and act on it as if it were an established certainty. We know that we are fallible, and we are bound in conscience to consider this in every thing we do. The evidence, as it strikes our minds at the time, may convince us, that our own opinion is well founded ; and this would be sufficient, if we were infallible in all our judgments, to establish it as a principle, on which we might safely and innocently act. But we are not infallible ; and hence arises the necessity and obligation of considering how the same evidence strikes other minds ; and how our acting on it will affect the paramount claims and rights of others. Because we are bound in all cases to act consistently with our own convictions of right, it does not follow that we are bound in all cases to act consistently with our own convictions of truth or probability ; for though convinced, on the whole, that a proposition is true or probable, we may not be convinced of it in such a sense, or on such evidence or authority, as to think it right to assume it as a principle or rule of conduct. Our convictions of right itself, too, (we mean of right in the abstract) will be materially modified, in practice, by our knowledge, that other persons, equally competent as ourselves to form a judgment on the subject, hold different views, and hold them as sincerely and as confidently. We may think it right, abstractly considered, that a person holding certain opinions should be denounced as an apostate from Christianity ; but if we find that others, equally competent as ourselves to form a judgment on the subject, have come to different conclusions, we are bound in conscience to hesitate. In such a case the general question of right and duty is as much affected in reality by the convictions of others, as by our own, and ought to be as much affected in the eye of conscience.*

* 'The censor Cato, the saint Bernard, and the reformer Calvin were equally insensible to the blandishments of love, the allurements of pleasure, and the vanity of wealth ; and so, likewise, were the monsters Marat and Robespierre ; but all equally sacrificed every generous and finer feeling of humanity, which none are naturally without, to an abstract principle or opinion ; which, by narrowing their understandings, hardened their hearts, and left them under the unrestrained guidance of all the atrocious and sanguinary passions, which party violence could stimulate or excite.

'This will always be the effect of such principles or opinions, whatever they are ; whether true or false ; whether mild or severe ; pro-

Granting, however, for a moment, that Exclusionists cannot consistently nor conscientiously refrain from denouncing Unitarians as incapable of salvation; what then? Do they think to prove that they have not done what Dr. Channing has charged them with doing, by saying that they have done it, and must do it, on principle? Do they cease to be intolerant and persecuting, because they maintain, that they are so for conscience' sake? Will the good people of this Commonwealth look with less distrust and aversion on the measures of a set of men, many of them from other states, who are casting about firebrands, arrows, and death in this community, because they think to justify it by exclaiming, Gentlemen, we love you all; hence our denunciations; we must do so, or we should not be consistent. A writer, who will hardly be suspected of latitudinarianism either in politics or religion, after speaking of the many amiable and excellent

vided they are embraced with a degree of eagerness and avidity sufficient to give men confidence in their infallibility, and make them supersede the feelings of nature. To enforce the doctrines of a religion, which prohibits violence and bloodshed in every case, even that of self-defence, more violence has been exercised, more blood shed, and more cruel tortures inflicted, than in any other dispute or quarrel, that ever was engendered by the turbulent and unruly passions of men; and whether the point at issue be a dogma of religion, an axiom of philosophy, or a maxim of politics, its effects will be the same, provided it has sufficient influence to enslave the natural affections of the soul, and induce men to prefer a theorem of the head, to a sentiment of the heart.

'Had Lord Bacon seen such events as have lately happened, he would not have said, that "Atheism did never perturb States"; for if men once unite to maintain systematically that there are many Gods, one God, or no God, the moral effects will be exactly the same; the dogma instantly becomes the rallying point of a sect or faction; and all the selfish, violent, and atrocious passions are collected into its vortex. It is true, that a negative dogma is less likely, than an affirmative one, to engage such passions; because it is less flattering to that opinionative pride and presumption, which is necessary to give them vigor and energy sufficient for any great exertions: but, nevertheless, that it may become the rallying point of a faction, and be a motive for very bloody persecution, we have had abundant proof. If men can once suppose an opinion to be infallibly certain, they will feel an inclination to propagate it; and consequently square their morality to that inclination; which will lead them to employ force, if persuasion do not prevail. Truth, they say, is the foundation of all virtue; and truth is, to every man, that which he himself thinks.' — *Knight's Analytical Inquiry into the Principles of Taste*, pp. 236 — 239.

qualities of Sir Thomas More, goes on to say ; ' But the impelling motive for his conduct was, his assent to the tenet, that belief in the doctrines of the Church was essential to salvation. For upon that tenet, whether it is held by Papist or Protestant, toleration becomes, what it has so often been called, soul-murder ; persecution is, in the strictest sense, a duty ; and it is an act of religious charity to burn heretics alive, for the purpose of deterring others from damnation. The tenet is proved to be false by its intolerable consequences ; and no stronger example can be given of its injurious effect on the heart, than that it should have made Sir Thomas More a persecutor.' *

Here we must pause for the present. Appearances threaten a warm and protracted controversy. We did not provoke it ; we do not fear it. We have sometimes thought, that this sudden outcry among the Exclusionists, charging Unitarians with abuse, misrepresentation, and intolerance, was to be regarded merely as the finesse of cunning disputants. Feeling themselves peculiarly obnoxious to these same charges, and continually assailed and harassed by them from every quarter, and wholly unable to meet and repel them by argument or evidence, they have at length hit on the expedient of hurling them back on their accusers, without inquiring or much caring whether they can be sustained or not. In this way they may at least hope to divert, for a time, the public attention, and throw dust in the eyes of their own friends, and insinuate every where a general and vague impression, that all this mutual recrimination respecting bigotry and exclusiveness is to be regarded in no other light, than as an unauthorized and discreditable bandying of odious imputations, in which both parties alike are implicated. But it will not do. If it is a mere artifice or temporary expedient, it will come to nought. If it is an attempt to crush, or silence, or check a rising sect by the mere force of numbers and vociferation ; the character not only of the Unitarians, but of the Orthodox generally in this State, is a sufficient pledge that it must fail utterly. We ask for no better question, to try the respective claims of the two parties to the public favor, than this, — Whose principles and measures are most conducive to free inquiry, religious liberty, and Christian charity ? This is the

* Southey's *Book of the Church*, Vol. II. pp. 26, 27.

controversy ; and considering the spirit and intelligence which are now abroad, and the obvious tendencies of society and the human mind, it is without a shadow of doubt or concern, that we commit its issues to the providence of Him who judgeth righteously.

ART. VII. DR. CODMAN'S *Speech in the Board of Overseers of Harvard College, February 3, 1831.* Boston. Pierce & Parker.

FROM a remote but uncertain period, graduates while preparing themselves for the ministry, have resided at Harvard College, that they might enjoy the advantages to be derived from the lectures on Divinity and other subjects, from the library, and from the literary society of the place. Their numbers gradually increased, until, in December 1815, the Corporation with the consent and at the instance of the Board of Overseers, addressed the following circular letter to a large number of the sons and friends of the College, asking their assistance in providing additional means for theological education in Harvard University.

'The Corporation of Harvard College have thought it their duty to adopt measures for increasing the means of Theological Education at the University. In order to enable students in divinity to reap the benefit of the eminent advantages which the College possesses for this purpose, there is need of funds for assisting meritorious students in divinity of limited means to reside at the University for a requisite time ; of one or more Professors, whose attention may be exclusively given to this class of students ; and of a separate building.

'The Corporation are disposed and determined to apply the resources of the College to this object, as far as other indispensable claims admit. But these resources being entirely inadequate to the accomplishment of their views, they feel it incumbent upon them to call upon the friends of the University, and of the Christian ministry, to coöperate with them in this interesting design.

'As the best method of obtaining the assistance of the liberal and pious, it is proposed to form a society "*for the education of candidates for the ministry in Cambridge University.*" All persons who shall subscribe five dollars a year shall be members,

and continue such so long as they shall pay the said annual sum ; — clergymen paying two dollars a year to be considered as members.

‘ All persons subscribing one hundred dollars to be considered members of the said Society for life. Subscriptions for smaller sums, either as annual payments or as donations, will be thankfully received.

‘ Whilst annual and life subscriptions are desired, it is hoped that affluent friends of the College and of the Churches will, by donations and bequests, do justice to the noble object of Christian munificence here presented.

‘ The Corporation are induced to believe, that a large number of persons in the metropolis and in various parts of this Commonwealth will view this invitation with favor ; as an occasion for doing what many of them have anxiously wished to see accomplished.

‘ In pursuance of this design, they have requested a large number of the sons and friends of the University to take charge of papers for subscription, and also clergymen to promote the object in their respective congregations. After the first Monday of April next, the Corporation will call a meeting of the subscribers, that they may adopt any measures they may see fit for carrying this charitable plan into effect, and particularly to choose five Trustees to act with the Corporation in the appropriation of the funds. In behalf of the Corporation, with the assent of the Board of Overseers,

‘ JOHN T. KIRKLAND, *President.*

‘ *Harvard College, Dec. 18, 1815.*

‘ Agreeably to public notice by the Corporation of Harvard College, the Subscribers to the Proposals for raising a Fund and forming a Society for increasing the means of Theological Education at the University of Cambridge, met July 17, 1816, at the Boston Athenæum.

‘ The Rev. President Kirkland was chosen Moderator of the meeting ; and Rev. Charles Lowell, Scribe.

‘ On motion, the Moderator was requested to open the meeting by prayer.

‘ It was then voted to form a “ Society for the Promotion of Theological Education in Harvard University.”

‘ A plan of a constitution and rules was then offered by one of the subscribers to the Fund, which having been considered and amended, was adopted.’

According to this constitution, the only power and authority claimed by the Society in regard to the School is thus expressed in the eighth Rule of the second Article.

'It shall be the duty of the Trustees, in conjunction with the President and Fellows of Harvard College (with whom they are for this purpose united, the whole to form one Board, seven of whom shall make a quorum), to attend to the execution of the objects of this Society; especially to appropriate the funds which may be from time to time collected, to assist young men of competent talents, pure morals, and piety, in preparing themselves for the Christian ministry, and to provide for them the best instruction which the funds of the Society will admit; it being understood, that every encouragement be given to the serious, impartial, and unbiased investigation of Christian truth; and that no assent to the peculiarities of any denomination of Christians be required either of the Students or Professors or Instructors. The Professors and Instructors are to be chosen according to the usages of the University.'

The Corporation and Board of Overseers by a formal vote gratefully accepted the proposition of the Society to found a Theological School in the University, and the funds were paid over to the College Treasurer, and solemnly pledged to this object. From this time regular instruction has been given to the theological students by professors or teachers appointed by the Corporation and Overseers, and the Theological School has constituted an integral and essential part of the University. To give greater distinctness and independence to this department, it was thought best in 1819 to institute a regular Theological Faculty, for the regulation and government of which the following rules and statutes were proposed by the Corporation, and approved and confirmed, in the usual manner, by the Board of Overseers.

'I. The Theological Department, or Faculty of Theology of the University, shall comprise the President and four Professors.

'1. The Hollis Professor of Divinity; who shall give instruction to the theological students in positive and controversial divinity, including the evidences and principles of natural religion, the evidences, doctrines, and duties of revealed religion; said Professor performing all the services enjoined by the Statutes of the Hollis Professorship, which he holds.

'2. The Hancock Professor of Hebrew and other Oriental Languages; who shall give instruction in those languages, and in their application to the interpretation of the Scriptures.

'3. A Professor of Sacred Literature, or Expository Theology; who shall treat of the criticism and interpretation of the Scriptures.

‘4. A Professor of Pastoral Theology ; who shall give instruction in the duties of the pastoral office, and the composition and delivery of sermons ; also in ecclesiastical history and polity.

‘The Professors in the above branches may in their instruction omit the particular consideration of such subjects in their respective departments, as may be pointed out by the Corporation ; said subjects being sufficiently discussed by other professors or instructors in the University.

‘II. The Professor in the third department shall be denominated Dexter Professor of Sacred Criticism, and shall receive towards his compensation the increase of the Dexter Fund, granted by the trustees of said fund, and the sum of seven hundred and forty dollars, granted for the purpose by the Society for promoting Theological Education in Harvard University.

‘III. The Dexter Professor, and the Professor of Pastoral Theology, when chosen, shall perform such duties in the theological instruction of the University, as may from time to time be assigned by the Corporation, including, with respect to the Dexter Professor, those specified by the trustees of the Society above named, and shall have the privileges and powers pertaining to the Professors of the College generally, as well as make the usual promises and engagements.’

The Society for the Promotion of Theological Education in Harvard University was reorganized, in 1824, under a new Constitution, part of the eighth article of which ran thus ;

‘The Directors shall take the general oversight and superintendence of the Institution, and make regulations for the admission, instruction, and discipline of the students ; such regulations to be submitted to the Corporation of Harvard College, for their assent, in all cases wherein by the Constitution of the University such assent may be requisite. The Directors shall from time to time examine into the state of the Institution, its moral and religious character, and the progress of the students, and enforce a strict and faithful compliance with all the regulations ; and they shall take all measures tending to promote the welfare and success of the Institution, as far as may be done by them without interference with the authority of said Corporation.’

The government of the University, by assenting to this Constitution, conferred new powers on the Directors of the Society, which they held and exercised as its officers or agents. The whole course of the proceedings, however, as well as the language of the Constitution, shows that it was

the intention of all the parties to preserve the legal authority of the Corporation and Overseers unimpaired; and that it was no part of the plan to sever the School in any respect from the University. It was thought that the interests of the College and the School would be promoted in various ways by engaging the services of several gentlemen, not in the Corporation, in its general oversight and superintendence. On trial, however, it was found, that the new arrangement was attended with many practical inconveniences; in consequence of which the Society saw fit, during the last year, with the consent of the Corporation, to resign all the authority in the School which had been delegated to its officers. At the same time it transferred to the Corporation all the power and control it had previously held and exercised over the funds of the institution. The Society, under its present organization, has no connexion whatever, either with the University, or the School, or the funds of the School.

These and other changes required that the existing statutes of the Theological Faculty should be revised and thrown into a new draft. This was accordingly done by the Corporation, and the Statutes in their new form were submitted to the Overseers for their assent, as follows;

' Chapter I. Of the Department in general.

' 1. There shall be three Professors in the Department, *to wit*, the Hollis Professor of Divinity, the Professor of Biblical Literature, and the Professor of Pulpit Eloquence and the Pastoral Care. The Government of the University reserves the right to give an additional title to the two last named Professors, or to either of them, whenever any donation shall be made for their support, amounting to one half of the sum required for their annual salaries, or when it shall be thought proper for any other reason.

' 2. The President of the University, and the three Professors above mentioned, with such other Professors or Officers as the Corporation may from time to time designate, shall constitute the Theological Faculty of the University.

' 3. The Theological Faculty shall have power, and it shall be their duty, to make regulations respecting the studies, and for promoting industry, order, good morals, and piety among the students: Provided the same be not repugnant to the constitution and laws of the University, nor to the Statutes of this Department; and all such regulations shall be forthwith laid before the Corporation, and shall be in force until repealed by them.

'4. The Faculty shall also oversee and administer the interior government of the School, and the discipline of the students. And for this purpose one of the Professors shall be appointed by the Corporation to be Dean of the Faculty, whose duty it shall be to enforce the due observance and execution of all the statutes and regulations of the Department, to call meetings of the Faculty, and to keep a record of their votes and proceedings; and as the representative and organ of the Faculty, to communicate with the Government of the University, and also with others when occasion shall require it, on all subjects relating to the School, or to the Department.

'5. The Theological Professors, with any others whom the Corporation shall from time to time appoint to that duty, shall perform divine service in the chapel of the University on the Lord's day throughout the year. The public weekly lecture on divinity required of the Hollis Professor by the Statutes of his Professorship, shall be delivered as heretofore in the chapel on the Lord's day, and constitute part of the religious services, until otherwise ordered by the Corporation; and so long as those lectures shall be so delivered, the Hollis Professor shall perform one half of the divine service in the chapel on the Lord's day. The other half of all the said services shall be performed by the other two Professors.

'6. The daily prayers in the chapel of the University, and also those in the chapel of Divinity Hall, shall be attended by the Theological Professors; the respective services being performed by each of them alternately, or otherwise divided between them, as shall be from time to time prescribed by the Corporation: Provided, that the services in Divinity Hall may be performed by any of the Theological Students, under the superintendence of a Professor, when the Theological Faculty shall think fit so to order. Each one of the Professors will consider it his duty, by all the means in his power, to cultivate in the students the spirit of personal religion, and of their profession.

'7. The Professors shall be elected by the President and Fellows, with the consent and approbation of the Overseers; and they may be removed by the same authority, for any just and sufficient cause.

'8. It shall be in the power of the Corporation, with the assent of the Overseers, to make any alterations and amendments in the Statutes of the Department, which may from experience be found useful, so as the same be not repugnant to the foundations of the respective Professorships.

'Chapter II. Of the Hollis Professorship of Divinity.

[After reciting the twelve original Statutes of Mr. Hollis's foundation, which were inserted in our Review of that gentle-

man's life and benefactions, and are not affected by the new arrangement, the Statutes of the Theological Faculty proceed.]

'13. Inasmuch as the fund given by Mr. Hollis furnishes less than one tenth part of the salary of the Professor, and the remainder thereof is paid by the University from other sources, it is considered to be no violation of the sixth article above written, to require of the person holding the office of Hollis Professor of Divinity, so long as he shall receive a full Professor's salary, some other services not inconsistent with those prescribed as above, by the founder of this Professorship, and not repugnant to his Statutes; the Professor elect assenting thereto at the time of accepting his appointment. It is accordingly further enacted, that, —

'The person holding the office of Hollis Professor of Divinity shall perform all the duties above prescribed and assigned to him in the first chapter of these Statutes.

'14. He shall also give instruction to the Theological Students in Natural Religion, Ethics, and the Evidences of Revealed Religion; also in Ecclesiastical History, and in Dogmatic Theology. The duties prescribed in this article, so far as they are embraced in the foregoing original Statutes of the founder, are not to be considered as requiring additional courses of lectures, but only as prescribing the mode in which the instruction provided for in the original Statutes shall be given.

'Chapter III. *Of the Professor of Biblical Literature.*

'1. The Professor of Biblical Literature shall give instruction in the interpretation of the Old and New Testament, and in the collateral branches of Sacred Literature, which may tend to promote a critical knowledge of the Holy Scriptures.

'2. His duties will embrace a course of instruction on the interpretation of the New Testament, to be given to each of the three classes of Theological Students, and like courses on the interpretation of the Old Testament, to the Middle and the Senior Classes.

'3. If the Government should think fit at any time so to order, this Professor shall give instruction in the Hebrew language, which will make up two complete courses of instruction to be given by him throughout the three years.

'Chapter IV. *Of the Professor of Pulpit Eloquence and the Pastoral Care.*

'1. The Professor of Pulpit Eloquence and the Pastoral Care shall give instruction in the art of preaching, or the composition and delivery of sermons; and also on the duties of the Pastoral Office.

'2. His instructions will be given in written lectures, so far

as the subjects may require or admit that mode of communication ; and also in frequent personal intercourse with the students, either separately, or in classes, or in familiar lectures on the public and private duties of their profession, together with such private advice, expostulation, reproof, and encouragement, as may tend to the cultivation and improvement of their personal and professional characters.

‘3. The Government will hereafter make such further and more particular regulations respecting the duties of the Professor, as experience shall show to be necessary and expedient.’

These Statutes were referred by the Board of Overseers to a Committee, as usual, who reported in favor of assenting thereto, and this report was accepted February 3, 1831, by a vote of thirty-four to twelve. It was on a previous motion to recommit the whole subject to the same Committee, with instructions to report at the next stated meeting of the Board, that the Rev. Dr. Codman of Dorchester made a speech against the adoption of the Statutes, a printed copy of which is now before us.

From these historical notices it will appear, that every thing which has been done respecting the Theological School has been done openly and with deliberation, by the authority of the Corporation, and with the consent of the Board of Overseers. It will also be seen, that Dr. Codman entirely mistook the real question before the Board of Overseers, if he supposed that it was, whether a Theological School should be instituted in the University, or whether that School should have a regular Theological Faculty, or whether that Faculty should have its Statutes. The question, and the only question, properly before the Board was, whether the Statutes of 1819 *should continue in force*, or be superseded by those of 1831, as being better in themselves, or better adapted to the present condition and circumstances of the School. At the same time we have no wish to evade the general question, whether it was right or expedient in the Corporation and Overseers to establish a Theological School in the University, in the first instance. A full, and, in our view, perfectly satisfactory article on this point, and in reply to Dr. Codman, has been prepared, but the present Number was so far printed off before it was received, as to make it necessary to defer it to the next.

GRAY & BOWEN

HAVE JUST PUBLISHED

IV.

THE NEW TESTAMENT, in the Common Version, conformed to GRIESBACH'S STANDARD GREEK TEXT. *Third Edition.*

'This edition of the New Testament we have stated to be *undoubtedly* more correct, more conformed to the original, than our common editions. On this point we speak strongly, because we wish to call to it the attention of Bible Societies, and of all conscientious Christians. To such we say, — Here is a translation, undoubtedly more faithful to the original than that in common use.' — *Christian Examiner.*

The present edition of the work is comprised in one large 12mo volume; neatly done up in cloth, at \$1 per copy.

V.

QUESTIONS ON SELECT PORTIONS OF THE FOUR EVANGELISTS, with References to the Scriptures for Answers. — By the Rev. JOSEPH ALLEN. — *Second Edition.*

The rapid sale of this valuable SUNDAY-SCHOOL BOOK has induced the publishers to stereotype it. Among the improvements in this edition is a series of Questions, to be answered by reference to the Map of Palestine, accompanying the work.

VI.

FIELD'S QUESTIONS ON THE GOSPELS, adapted to Carpenter's Harmony. — Price 25 cents single, or \$14 per hundred.

VII.

THE HISTORY of the LIFE and OPINIONS of the APOSTLE PAUL. By the Editor of 'Evangelical History,' the Author of 'Remarks on the Miraculous Character of Christ,' &c.

VIII.

THE LIBRARY OF EDUCATION. Vol. I.—Some Thoughts concerning Education, by JOHN LOCKE; and a Treatise of Education, by JOHN MILOTN, with an Appendix, containing Locke's Memoranda of Study.

IX.

NEW YORK COLLECTION OF HYMNS.

GRAY & BOWEN have just received a supply of the 'New York Collection of Psalms and Hymns for Social and Private Worship,' and are now ready to supply orders for the same.

Societies and others wishing for this Collection can be furnished by the quantity on reasonable terms.

FOR SALE AS ABOVE,

CHANNING'S WORKS, being his Discourses, Reviews, and Miscellanies, in one volume, royal 8vo.

SERMONS by the late Rev. ABIEL ABBOT, D. D., of Beverly, with a Memoir of his Life, by S. EVERETT.

THE
CHRISTIAN EXAMINER.

GRAY & BOWEN,

NO. 141, WASHINGTON STREET, BOSTON.

AGENTS.

NEW HAMPSHIRE.

PORTSMOUTH, J. W. Foster.
EXETER, F. Grant.
DOVER, & } S. C. Stevens.
GREAT FALLS, }
KEENE, George Tilden.
CONCORD, Marsh, Capen, & Lyon.
CHARLESTOWN, Webber & Bowman.

MASSACHUSETTS.

CAMBRIDGE, Hilliard & Brown.
DEDHAM, H. Mann & Son.
CONCORD, J. Stacy.
TAUNTON, F. Dunbar.
SALEM, { J. R. Buffum,
Whipple & Lawrence.
DANVERS, A. Trask, Jr.
NEWBURYPORT, Charles Whipple.
HINGHAM, C. & E. B. Gill.
NEW BEDFORD, William Howe.
NANTUCKET, George W. Ewer.
LANCASTER, Carter, Andrews, & Co.
GROTON, A. Richardson.
WORCESTER, C. Harris.
SPRINGFIELD, Elisha Edwards.
NORTHAMPTON, Simeon Butler.

MAINE.

PORTLAND, Samuel Colman.
HALLOWELL, C. Spaulding.
BELFAST, E. T. Morrill.
AUGUSTA, H. Spaulding.
BANGOR, B. Nourse.
EASTPORT, H. S. Favor.
NORWAY, Asa Barton.

RHODE ISLAND.

PROVIDENCE, { George Dana,
A. S. Beckwith.

CONNECTICUT.

NEW HAVEN, H. Howe.
HARTFORD, H. & F. J. Huntington.
NORWICH, T. Robinson.

VERMONT.

BURLINGTON, C. Goodrich.

NEW JERSEY.

TRENTON, D. Fenton.

NEW YORK.

ALBANY, Little & Cummings.
NEW YORK, { C. S. Francis,
D. Felt.
TRENTON, Isaac B. Pierce.
CANANDAIGUA, Bemis & Ward.
AUBURN, H. Ivison & Co.
BUFFALO, Oliver G. Steele & Co.
ROCHESTER, Marshall & Dean.

PENNSYLVANIA.

PHILADEL- { E. Littell,
PHIA, { Carey & Hart.
PITTSBURG, Johnson & Stockton.

MARYLAND.

BALTIMORE, E. J. Coale.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

WASHINGTON, Thompson & Homans.

VIRGINIA.

RICHMOND, J. H. Nash.
NORFOLK, C. Hall.
WHEELING, A. & E. Pickett.

KENTUCKY.

LOUISVILLE, James A. Frazer.
LEXINGTON, Thomas Smith.

OHIO.

CINCINNATI, { E. H. Flint,
Bradford & Co.,
{ N. & G. Guilford.

NORTH CAROLINA.

RALEIGH, J. Gales & Son.

SOUTH CAROLINA.

CHARLESTON, Thomas Cousins.
COLUMBIA, B. D. Plant.

GEORGIA.

AUGUSTA, W. J. Hobby.
SAVANNAH, Thomas M. Driscoll.

ALABAMA.

MOBILE, Odiorne & Smith.

TENNESSEE.

NASHVILLE, W. Tannehill.

MISSISSIPPI.

NATCHEZ, F. Beaumont.

LOUISIANA.

NEW ORLEANS, M. Carroll.

☞ The work will be sent *by mail*, to any part of the United States, on the remittance of one year's subscription (four dollars) to the Publishers, Boston, or to any of the agents,—subscribers paying postage, and taking the risk of conveyance.

The subscription becomes due on the publication of the second number; that is, on the 1st of May. Distant subscribers are expected to transmit the amount of their yearly subscriptions as soon as they receive the second number of each year.